DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 184 SO 019 883

AUTHOR Brueseke, Bonnie A.
TITLE An Annotated Bibliography Dealing with Discipline-Based Art Education.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 94p.; Exit Project, Indiana University, South Bend.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aesthetic Education; *Art; *Art Education; *Art History; *Art Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS Aesthetics; Art Criticism; *Discipline Based Art Education; *Getty Center for Education in the Arts

ABSTRACT

The J. Paul Getty Trust (Los Angeles) and the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (Los Angeles) are playing a major role in the development, growth and acceptance of discipline-based art education (DBAE). The influence of the Getty Center is growing; art education is changing; and the existing DBAE theory is evolving. This annotated bibliography contains three sections: (1) 13 items regarding the antecedents of DBAE; (2) 21 items on the research and development activities of the Getty Center relating to DBAE; and (3) five items on developing issues in DBAE. An extended summary section also discusses these same three topic areas in depth. A glossary of 22 terms relating to art education is included. (PPB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307184

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY DEALING WITH DISCIPLINE-BASED ART EDUCATION

by

Bonnie A. Brueseke

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

BONNIE A. BRUESEKE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Study Directed By

Charles R. DuVall, Ph.D.

SO019883

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the course S591--Exit Project
Indiana University At South Bend
April 1988

SP 030 544

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
Statement of the Problem		2
Purpose of the Study		2
Organization of the Study		2
Limitations of the Study		3
Glossary		4
ANNOTATIONS		
Part I.	A review of the literature regarding the antecedents of discipline-based art education.	7
Part II.	A review of the research and development activities of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in promoting the acceptance of DBAE, with specific attention to the development of The Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts and DBAE theory.	17
Part III.	A summary of developing issues in DBAE.	35
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		
Summary		39
Conclusions		83
Recommendations		84
BIBLIOGRAPHY		85
STUDENT QUALIFICATIONS		91

INTRODUCTION

In 1984, Greer (the Director of the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts of the J. Paul Getty Trust) published an article which summarized "the premises and ideas defining "discipline-based art education (i.e., DBAE)" (212). Subsequent articles of an expansive nature appeared in various art journals.

Although critical of many aspects of DBAE, Hamblen (1987) stated that, "DBAE has the potential of providing a national framework for art instruction" (76). A Canadian art educator, not involved with the Getty Institute's programs, wrote, "The J. Paul Getty Trust has the potential to bring about significant change in art education in the United States" (MacGregor 1985:245). McFee (1984), in discussing the contributions of the 1983 Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, wrote about the Getty Trust, and noted that "The fact that such a large foundation supports art education in elementary schools carries weight in affecting change" (280).

The influence of the Getty activities may be seen locally in the new Fine Arts Proficiency Guide issued by the Indiana Department of Education in June of 1987. Two of the four art references for the guide were from the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (Eisner 1987, J. Paul Getty Trust 1985; referred to in this paper as Eisner n.d. and Getty Center for Education in the Arts 1985). The guide reflected the DBAE approach of integrating the four disciplines of art history, art criticism, aesthetics and art production.

From this literature it is apparent that an understanding of the role and of the activities of the Trust's entities with respect to discipline-based art education would be of interest to those involved in art education.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The emerging acceptance of the DBAE approach in art education of The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, merits an investigation of its history, those persons who have most influenced its evolution and developing issues of the DBAE approach.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Through the study it was intended to show the continuing influence of the J. Paul Getty Trust and The Getty Center for Education in the Arts in the development, growth and acceptance of so-called "discipline-based art education" (referred to as "DBAE") in the American educational system. The literature showed that the influence of the Getty Center is growing, that change is indeed happening in art education in this nation, that existing DBAE theory is itself changing, and that there remain certain unresolved criticisms of DBAE that will continue to generate comment and even disagreement.

Ultimately it was intended that the reader have the ability through this paper to have a better understanding of the growth of DBAE.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study was composed of three areas, i.e., Part I---a review of the literature regarding the antecedents of DBAE, Part II.---a review of the research and development activities of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in promoting the acceptance of DBAE, with specific attention to the development of the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts and DBAE theory, and Part III.---a summary of developing issues in DBAE. The annotations for the most part are chronologically arranged.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Limitations confronted in preparing and completing the study included the time limitation of a semester, lack of consistency in the various definitions used in the literature, difficulty in determining who is speaking for the Getty, lack of research on DBAE, and the fact that the DBAE approach is evolving and presently far from absolute.

GLOSSARY

aesthetic: "adj. (1) pertaining to aesthetics or to the beautiful as the quality either of an object or of an experience; (2) pertaining to whatever is immediately experienced or felt, as distinguished from what is arrived at by mediate inference or reasoning" (Good 1973:18).

aesthetic education: "education pertaining to the theories of beauty, its essential character, and methods of recognizing, analyzing, and evaluating beauty; in the public schools, aesthetic education is generally developed in connection with or as a by-product of the program of art appreciation" (Good 1973:19).

aesthetic perception, types of: a term that refers to special types of perception which seem to depend on general physical constitution and to be the expression of an individual's personality; such types are sometimes divided into objective, physiological, associative, and character types and bear relationship to the thinking, sensation, feeling, and intuitive types of Jung and to the modern artistic styles of realism, expressionism, surrealism, and constructivism" (Good 1973:19).

aesthetic scanning: "a method of looking at a work of art that focuses on identifying and discussing its sensory, formal, expressive, and technical properties" (Greer & Rush 1985:35)

Aesthetic Scanning Chart consists of:

"I. Aesthetic Perception
- A. Sensory Properties....note what actually exists within as object or event and then identify...the character of its sensory properties (qualities that can be seen, felt, or heard): In art, identify the nature of elements such as shapes...,lines...,values...,textures...,colors...,etc.
- B. Formal Properties...respond in ways in which sensory properties are organized within an object or event by identifying the character of its formal properties...: [e.g.] ...unity....variety....repetition....balance....etc.
- C. Expressive Properties...reflect upon both the nature of the existing sensory properties and the ways they appear to be organized and then speculate about the possible meanings of an object or event by identifying its expressive properties. [e.g.] Mood language--nuances of feeling describable in terms such as somber, menacing, frivolous, etc.; Dynamic states--arousing a sense of tension, conflict, relaxation, etc.; and Idea and ideal language--interpretations of social or psychological events and beliefs, and/or expressions of courage, wisdom, etc.
- D. Technical Properties...attempt to identify how it was created because of the significance of its technical properties. [e.g.]... surface texture created by an impasto application of paint..."

II. Aesthetic Criticism
   A. Historical. Determining the nature and expressive intent of works of art within their historical context and in relation to school, period, style, and culture.
   B. Recreative. Apprehending and relating imaginatively what the artist has expressed in a specific work.
   C. Judicial. Estimating the value of works of art in relation to other works using three criteria: degree of formal excellence, truth, and significance" (Broudy 1987:52-53).

aesthetics: "(1) the systematic study of beauty, especially as manifested in the fine arts; (2) the branch of inquiry that deals with the nature of beauty and the principals governing its production and evaluation; (3) the study of one's responses to artistic and immediately sensuous phenomena" (Good 1973:19).

art: "human activities aimed at the accomplishment of or participation in aesthetic experience; in common usage activities that involve creative ability, ingenuity, judgment, and skill, resulting in an object or artifact" (Good 1973:40).

art education: "instruction and practice in the visual and spatial arts, as carried on in the schools: frequently recognized major area are fine, industrial, graphic, and theater arts; specific visual arts include drawing, design, color, construction, history of art, and art appreciation" (Good 1973:40).

art, fine: "the conscious use of creative imagination in the production of objects or expressive forms and intended for one's aesthetic experience" (Good 1973:40).

art production: "the direct experience of creating art...Learning about materials, acquiring techniques, gaining perceptual skills, and developing imagination through resolving the ambiguity inherent in the creative process..." (Spratt 1987: 157).

Arts, visual and spatial: "a term uses by artists, authors, and art educators to embrace the entire field of art variously designated as visual arts, spatial arts, or fine, industrial, and related arts; introduced in to the nomenclature of art education in an attempt to coin a term that would avoid the distinction implied between fine and not fine, practical and impractical, or useful and nonuseful concepts of art, includes the following areas of study: art appreciation, architecture, sculpture, painting, industrial art, graphic art, advertising art, domestic or household art, civic art, theater art, and history of art" (Good 1973:43).

criticism, art: (1) evaluating and/or analyzing with knowledge and rational criteria works of art, literature, drama, etc.;(2) an attempt to explain or give reasons for one's response to, liking for, or evaluation of an art work." [Also "External, historical and internal criticism"] (Good 1973:154).

discipline-based art education (DBAE): "an approach to teaching art; The focus of discipline-based art instruction is on art within general education and within the context of aesthetic education. Four parent disciplines--aesthetics, studio art [art production], art history, and art criticism--are taught by means of a formal, continuous, sequential, written curriculum across grade levels in the same way as other academic subjects" (Greer 1984:212).

experience, aesthetic: "that phase of experience dealing essentially with the perception, interpretation, and enjoyment of beauty; differentiated from nonaesthetic experience by its emphasis on intrinsic values" (Good 1973:226).

history of art: as a school subject, the study of an organized body of materials dealing with art expression through the ages, with specific periods or schools of art in their relation to the general development of art, and with the lives and works of artists having historical significance, such a study being undertaken with a view to increasing and enriching the student's appreciation of art works, whether old or new, and to supplying him with an historical perspective by which to see and understand better the current tendencies in art" (Good 1987:283).

ANNOTATIONS

Part I. A review of the literature regarding the antecedents of discipline-based art education.

Barkan, Manuel. "Transition In Art Education-Changing Concepts of Curriculum Content and Teaching." Art Education 15.7 (Oct. 1962): 12-18, 27, 28.

Barkan began this paper by conceding that the field of art education like much of society is involved in a period of "transition and significant change...[and continued by noting that] Favored ideas an goals, which for some time have been assumed to be the proper bases for wise curriculum content and sound teaching practice, are now being held up to question. Regarding the change, he suggested that "When basic ideas are in the process of transition, there is and must be an inevitable grinding of opinions one upon the other" (12). As he analyzed the debate evolving over such change he compressed the various issues or assumptions into the three following categories: 1)The way people "ought to be treated if...[they are] to become educated in art" (13), 2) Criteria used in "understanding and judging...works of art" (14), and 3) "The prevailing conceptions within...[the] profession about experience with art media in the teaching of art" (16). Regarding this first category, Barkan suggested that current literature suggests that "art is free expression; everyone can learn to express; spontaneity is the key; art experiences are developmentally valuable; and...the educational job is to teach the whole child rather than to try to make an artist out of him" (13). Barkan noted that these beliefs were being challenged in recent art education conferences "...which have emphasized the return of art to art education..."(13). Influenced by Bruner's ideas from the "Woods Hole Conference of 1959," Barkan applied his idea..."that the key educational task is to give students an understanding of the fundamental structure of any subject we see fit to teach" (13-14). He asserted from this..."that there is a subject matter of the field of art and it is important to teach it" (14). Regarding the second category, he stated that "the capacity for sensitive and knowledgeable judgment rests in large part on insights gained through acquaintance with and careful study of great works of art" (15). Barkan found the third category to be the one which today most directly affects "the day to day teaching of art now going on in the public schools" (16). Barkan suggested that the art teacher's primary job was that of helping students "to behave like like the artists they can become rather than doing something else." (18) He criticized the overconcern of some with the development of ever expanding and new media, by suggesting that the sampling of too many media was problematic, i.e., "Different artists use different media, but no serious artist we know about flits from medium to medium" (18).

Barkan, Manuel. "Is There A Discipline Of Art Education" Studies in Art Education 4.2 (Spring 1963): 4-9.

In this article, Barkan noted that it was his opinion that while "there are potentialities for a discipline of art education...[they] have not yet been realized" (4). He outlined his belief that "Art education could become a discipline if it would develop a distinctive structure...[it] does have a history of ideas and a body of concepts... Lacking,...is an appropriate and pervasive set of rules--a characteristic strategy and a consistent approach to whatever goals purposes, positions, or points of view to which art education would aspire" (4). He pointed out that he was not "advocating any single-minded or fixed ideology of art education...[and that he personally believed that there was a lack of] a sufficient degree of penetrating and critical argument and debate among differing ideologies" (5). He stated his belief "that art history, art criticism, and aesthetics are basic to knowledge and understanding of art and that they too have sufficient internal consistencies and integrities to warrant the status of disciplines in their own right" (5). He stated that "Art education can become a discipline, because it does have a distinguishable and particular focus of concern, namely the, the teaching of art....the central concern of art education is the teaching of art...;[which] is distinguishable from, though undoubtedly related to, the making of art itself, its history, its criticism and philosophy, or the behavior of people who make and look at works of art for whatever purposes which could be attributed to them" (6). He found support in Schwab's (1962) article and noted that "in the conceptual structure of a discipline there is a body of imposed conceptions" (7). He outlined the elements of a discipline as being "reciprocating structures of concept and syntax--ideas, beliefs, assumptions, and goals on the one hand; and a pattern of procedures, method of inquiry and characteristic strategy on the other" (8). In applying these criteria to determining whether art is indeed a discipline, he concluded by stating that "In the realm of conceptual structure, my opinion is that the field of art education rates a plus mark. The realm of syntactical structure, however draws a minus score" (8).

Kaufman, Irving. "Art Education: A Discipline" Studies in Art Education 4.2 (Spring 1963): 15-23.

Kaufman in this article stated that "It would be presumptuous to consider art education a discipline...[as] there is no characteristic and defining mode with which to identify it as a discipline" (15). In evaluating the general treatment accorded art education he suggested that "Even where it is accorded a favorable reception, there is little knowing evaluation of its content. It is still frequently treated as a 'frill and a fad' or as a channel to indiscriminate mass culture" (15). In suggesting that specific standards for art education may be problematic, he concluded that "A set of given standards would defeat the very aim of an open and unfettered creativity, one of the basic aims in the teaching of art" (17). Further he stated that "Its method of knowing is metaphoric, and its symbols are uniquely nonrational. It does not easily connect with the discursive method of most teaching, and it usually defies the rational probings of psychology" (18). He stressed that "In developing the eclectic creative ideas so prevalent in the schools, art education has put exceptional emphasis on process alone" (22). He concluded by noting that "the whole area of art education has been faced with the need for reappraisal for quite some time. Only an honest look can determine desirable new directions" (23).

Logan, Frederick M. "Is There A Discipline Of Art Education" Studies in Art Education 4.2 (Spring 1963): 10-14.

In this article Logan posited that "'Yes, dear colleagues, there is a discipline of art education'" (10). He claimed that "art education is not a branch of knowledge or learning, but is, viewed in the broadest terms, at least a dualism of the knowledges of art and education" (10). After reviewing basic dictionary definitions of the term "discipline", he concluded that even "Studio teachers and art historians...belong to a "discipline" which provides an art and pedagogical curriculum for elementary and secondary school teachers as they too "are in the profession of art education....For my part, the discipline of art education must be inclusive, not exclusive, and it includes every one of us engaged in any aspect of instruction in art" (14).

Barkan, Manuel. "Curriculum Problems In Art Education." A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development. (USOE Cooperative Research Project No. V-002) Ed. E. L. Mattil. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1966. 240-255.

In this paper presented at the Seminar, Barkan expressed the fact that his interest in "curriculum pertains to the general education in and about art for all American youth..." (241). He further stated that his focus "is on the elementary and secondary schools" (241). Even then some twenty years ago he found the national picture with regard to the teaching of art to be "depressing" (242). As a solution he did not advocate any type of "a national course of study", but rather wanted to recognize a "crying need for differentiated guides according to the special needs of neighborhood schools, rather than to proliferate the rash of local general guides..." (242) In analyzing the involvement of theory in "curricular problems", Barkan suggested that while "In a sense, the artist needs no theories....The art educator cannot avoid theory, because he must be guided by it; hence, he must synthesize the knowledge in art of the artist, and the knowledge about art of the aesthetician, the critic, and the historian. To the detriment of art education, however, we have anchored curriculum almost entirely in relation to the artist, only slightly in relation to the art historian; we have ignored the aesthetician and critic. Art curriculum is faltering, not because of efforts to attend to art history, but rather because we have not learned to use the aesthetician and critic, and the historian" (243). He confirmed his belief that while in contrast to the sciences there may appear to be an "absence of a formal structure of interrelated theorems...: the disciplines of art are of a different order" (244). He stated: "...there are controls operating in competent work by artists, critics and others engaged in art; and to this important extent, they engage in structured inquiry which is disciplined" (244). Regarding an acceptable curriculum, he concluded that what is necessary "is a problem-centered approach for students to learn to think in terms of qualitative dimensions that bear on life-centered problems...[and] a quest for understanding" (246) For a curriculum to be problem and discipline- centered, he suggested the inclusion of "studio production, criticism, and history" (246). In summing up his presentation, Barkan supported the development of "regional centers for art curriculum development, as suggested by Elliot Eisner...[suggesting that such centers would need] to be cooperative...and include expertise in art curriculum theory, art, (sic) criticism, aesthetics, history, language usage, research methodology, test development, teaching media, public school art faculty and administrators" (255).

Efland, Arthur. "The School Art Style: A Functional Analysis." Studies in Art Education 17.2 (1976): 37-44.

Efland wondered why art was included in the school day since it is not valued as highly as other school subjects. He stated that "the phenomenon of school art, what it is, and what it does" would be the topic of the paper (37). His explanation of school art included work done by the student as guided by the art or elementary classroom teacher. He described child art, as "a spontaneous, unsupervised form of graphic expression usually done outside of school by children for their own satisfaction..." and that it is different that school art (37). He asserted based on studies, that "school art is an institutional art style in its own right" (38). In the art taught in school, he submitted, "there is little resemblance or relation between what professional artists do and what children are asked to do" (39). Efland examined the various functions of the school art style: 1). "To provide...products that have the look of humanistic learning....an 'irregular', 'individual' look" (41). "If artwork has a free and creative look, school persons can say life in school is not just a cognitive matter" and 2). "To be easy and fun....and break up the... routine"....and be used as "therapy" (41). Art teachers therefore, "have difficulty introducing art criticism or history into their programs" since they don't feel they can make art an academic "subject" (42).

Clark, Gilbert., and Enid Zimmerman. "A Walk in the Right Direction: A Model for Visual Arts Education." Studies in Art Education 19.2 (1978): 34-49.

The authors listed various rationales for art programs which seem to be unrelated "to the real work of the arts and work of the artist" (34). They acknowledged the past influence of the Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development (Mattil, 1966) in fostering the "idea of educating the child as artist, critic, and historian" (34). They asserted that "Just as the 'school art style' (Efland, 1976) might be viewed as a distortion of the professional practices of the artist, so might a distorted school style art criticism and history result from poorly defined roles" (35). Adding the role of the aesthetician to the other three previously mentioned, they attempted "to establish a continuum of behaviors related to each role that would developmentally lead the learner from a naive to sophisticated understanding of each role" (35). They claimed that although "children cannot function as artists, art critics,...etc. they may experience tasks...related to each... role" (35). The authors asserted "that a focus upon one role should not dominate instruction or learner experience, nor should any one role be studied exclusively" (35). Detailed descriptions of each role including student and teacher tasks within 4 or 5 "content strands" were developed. The aesthetician role, they stated, needed to be added to the others since it "has a contribution to make to wholistic study of the visual arts" (45). Sources from the literature for each role model were used (41).

Clark, Gilbert., and Enid Zimmerman. "Toward a Discipline of Art Education." Phi Delta Kappan 63.1 (Sept. 1981): 53-55

Clark and Zimmerman submitted that "Art is basic and essential in a curriculum that aims to develop in all students those social, personal, and cognitive skills necessary for responsible participation in a democratic society" (53). They reviewed Barkan's (1963) work regarding "the need for a discipline of art education" and stated that it was Barkan who "started a dialogue among art educators that continues today" (53). In referring to the disciplines outlined by Barkan, they noted that the disciplines "--art history, aesthetics, art criticism, and art production--focus primarily on knowledge, skills and understandings" [and the] activities of practitioners working in the areas..." (54). They expanded these principles by suggesting that "this art content, to be meaningful for art education must take the form of appropriately structured learning experiences in the visual arts developed from the discipline of education" (54). They suggested that "four or five strands of content be derived from each professional role" (54) and that learners progress from an introductory level to a mastery level. The authors described the various content strands related to each of the four roles: Artist, Art Critic, Art Historian and Aesthetician. They commented on the role of research in art education and stated that "researchers must seek answers that establish the form and define the relevant content for learning experiences in art. Research should also identify and evaluate teaching strategies and methods. Only careful research will enable parents, teachers, art educators, and administrators to agree on the form and content of art education..." (55).

Smith, Ralph A. "The Changing Image of Art Education: Theoretical Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 3-34.

In this paper, the author, commissioned by The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, traced key writings over the last 20 to 30 years that indicated a change in art education from a child-centered, psychological approach to a discipline-based art education approach. He indicated that art educators in the 1960s such as Barkan (1963), Kaufman (1963), and Logan (1963) were considering what it meant for art education to be a discipline (3). As he discussed the Antecedents in Aesthetics, he defined the term aesthetics; described the two kinds of aesthetics (philosophical and scientific) and cited writers who exemplified the various forms of the two kinds. He then examined the contributions of aesthetics to art education theory. Under Antecedents in Educational Theory, theorists who emphasized the aspect of "art as a basic subject in a program of general education" are discussed (16). Authors and their literature (starting in the 60s) who reflected developments in cognitive psychology are reviewed under Educational Psychology and Art Education. Smith stated that a change in art education thinking went "from an interest in art's affective dimensions to its cognitive dimensions" (18). In the section, Antecedents in the Theory of Art Education textbooks that indicated the changing shift in art education are discussed, such as those of Feldman (1970); Eisner (1972); and Chapman (1978). Under Antecedents in Art-Educational Research, the research efforts in the areas of criticism and art history are listed. Smith then discussed various writers' definitions of art education and aesthetic education and indicated that the terms can be used interchangeably so long as the writer's intended use is clear. Next, he cited examples of writers who emphasized the productive creative domain. Antecedents in Museum Education were also described. In a concluding section, Smith reiterated that over the last 30 years, a general trend can be seen towards teaching something "formally or substantively about art" and that "...there can doubtless be varieties of discipline-based art education identified by different labels" outside the DBAE definition in this issue (26).

Efland, Arthur D. "Curriculum Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 57-94.

In this paper, commissioned by The Getty Center, Efland began with a brief review of "Art in the History of Education" and described the impact of Viktor Lowenfeld's ideas on art education (60). He then reviewed the more recent antecedents of DBAE and acknowledged that Greer (1984) "seems to have been first" to use the term discipline-based in the literature (61). He stated that besides Greer, the main curriculum antecedents of DBAE "can be traced ... to Manuel Barkan, Laura Chapman, Elliot Eisner, Stanley Madeja, Guy Hubbard, Mary Rouse, Frances Hine, and Harry Broudy" because of the connection the writers had to many past projects (61). Under The Curriculum Reform Movement of the 60s section, Efland noted the influence of Jerome Bruner who contended "that the disciplines...should be made the basis of the curriculum" (63). Under the section The Impact of Bruner and the Woods Hole Conference upon Art Education, Efland stated that Bruner's ideas fostered a direction for art educators "to approach their teaching in a disciplined way" (63). He explained his influence on participant of the Penn State Seminar--notably in Barkan's presentation. He described in detail the following sections dealing with projects of the curriculum antecedent writers: The Penn State Seminar; CEMREL'S Aesthetic Education Program; The Guidelines for Art Instruction through Television for the Elementary Schools; Chapman's Curriculum Planning Model; Hubbard and Rouse's " Art: Meaning, Method, and Media"; The Kettering Project in Art Education; The SWRL Elementary Art Program; and The Aesthetic Eye Project. The projects covered may differ in many ways but the common bond to DBAE is their attention to the areas of art history, art criticism and studio (86). Under Problematic Issues and Recommendations, Efland stated that "No unified conception of sequence emerged from the antecedent projects" (89). He questioned whether or not "lesson order should be determined by research, or by pedagological priorities?" (90).

Kern, Evan J. "Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education: State Departments of Education Curriculum Documents." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 35-56.

Kern, commissioned by the Getty Center, conducted a search of several thousand curriculum materials ("courses of study, curriculum guides, certification standards, etc.") and found courses of study to be the most relevant for this project (36). Materials were solicited from state art directors or found in the "library collection of the National Institute for Education" or in state archives (36). "References to the study of art history, art criticism. aesthetic theory, the practice of artists" in the materials determined their inclusion as antecedents even if the terms differed some from now (36). The survey covered the period from 1874-1984. Main conclusions from the survey were: "of the 4 disciplines of disciplined-based art education, only studio art has been continuously present during the 110 years covered by the documents"; "art history (including picture study)" was included for most of the time studied; "art criticism has received curricular attention only during the past 15 to 20 years"; and aesthetics received "almost no educational attention" (52). Further conclusions revealed: "teaching art solely for creativity and self-expression is in decline... and the inclusion of study in art history and art criticism, in addition to studio art is increasingly mentioned in the more recent curriculum documents" (53).

Sevigny, Maurice J. "Discipline-based Art Education and Teacher Education." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 95-126.

Sevigny, commissioned by the Getty Center, conducted a search of preservice and in-service teacher education courses and programs for art specialists that indicated DBAE antecedents. "Feedback from some...writers of papers included in this issue" reduced the initial list of 30 to "24 preservice programs" (96). Out of the 24, 14 programs were chosen to be part of a survey of preservice degree programs for "review of program shifts" between 1964 and 1985 (96, 102). Sevigny described several research and development projects during the 60s because of their concern for "issues of pedagogy or...methods for teacher training (102). He summarized the results of the survey which indicated that over "the past 20 years,...graduation requirements for art education programs have changed very little average requirement for art history is still only 9 hours. And a third of this...sample of programs still does not require any courses in art criticism or aesthetics" (109). He asserted "that DBAE is at an impasse unless a major redesign of teacher education courses and requirements is implemented to realize the goals of DBAE" (109). He described 4 "In-service Teacher Education Experiments" of the 60s and 70s (109). Sevigny concluded his paper with with a discussion of issues such as: defining "proper content for curriculum"; the "future of doctoral programs in art education"; and the role of "collaborative" planning programs" (119, 120).

Dobbs, Steven Mark., ed. Research Readings for Discipline-Based Art Education: A Journey Beyond Creating Reston, VA: National Art Education Association, 1988a.

In the introduction, Dobbs briefly traced the changes in art education over the last thirty years which lead to DBAE. He stated that the "focus of the present anthology is to provide for that community of professionals who are engaged in teacher preparation, both preservice and in-service, a source of research readings in art education which are germane to the evolution of discipline-based education" (8). The National Art Education Association chose to publish the readings and the "support for publication"..."was furnished by The Getty Center for Education in the Arts" (10). The "readings focus upon issues related to discipline-based art education rather than address it directly..." [the exception is the Greer, 1984 article which is included] (8). He explained that the editors chose twelve articles from "hundreds"....which "represent the four art disciplines, the four types of research, and a spectrum of sources in which [the] research materials appear" (9). The articles are "chronologically rather than thematically grouped, to emphasize the evolution of the DBAE paradigm" (9). The authors listed in order of their articles appearance in the anthology are: "Eisner; Day; MacGregor; Feldman; Smoke; Clark and Zimmerman; Gardner; Greer; Battin; Wilson; Erickson; and Price".

Part II. A review of the research and development activities of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in promoting the acceptance of DBAE, with specific attention to the development of the Getty Institute and DBAE theory.

Duke, Leilani Lattin. "The Getty Center for Education in the Arts." Art Education 36.5 (Sept. 1983): 4-8.

Duke, Director of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, Los Angeles, reviewed the background and interest of J. Paul Getty in collecting works of art. The author stated that when the administration of the Getty estate was concluded in 1982, the J. Paul Getty Trust ("a private operating foundation rather than a grants-making foundation") became responsible for spending "annually a minimum of 4 1/2% of the market value of its endowment..." (5). Duke said that, "the Trust will spend a significant amount of money annually on its operating activities--estimated to be between $50-60 million" (5). During 1981, the staff "met with hundreds of individuals" to assess visual art issues and needs (5). Then "groups of professionals from the fields of art history and scholarship, museums, and arts education" came to "respond to our findings" and "prioritize the needs" (5). The Trust decided to support four specific activities: 1) Another museum besides the Getty Museum in Malibu, 2) A "Center for the History of Art and the Humanities", 3) A "conservation institute" and 4) "A Center for Education in the Arts" (5). Regarding the latter, "the initial programs are conceived as research and development activities" (6). Duke stated that the following four programs were underway: 1) A "national research project" involving 7 school districts that are trying to provide programs in "art history, art criticism, art making and aesthetic awareness"; 2) A "school personnel development" project-- the "Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts"; 3) The "Experimentation and Application of [electronic] Media "to arts education; and 4) A "Getty Museum Education Demonstration Program" (6,7,8). Duke restated the need for arts education to be "reoriented away from...production activities and teaching of techniques" and "redefined to include along with creative and expressive activities, aesthetic perception, art history and art criticism" (8).

Williams, Harold M. "Philanthropy and Art Education--The Role of the Private Foundation." Design For Arts In Education 88.4 (March/April 1987): 12-14.

In this article, the author--the President and Chief Executive Officer of the J. Paul Getty Trust--outlined the involvement of the Trust in art education and also described his personal feelings about philanthropy generally. He relayed "Getty's purpose, [as] stated in the Trust Indenture as the diffusion of artistic and general knowledge" (12). He mentioned the Trust's preparatory evaluation of its future activities which began in 1981 with a "year-long investigation of the field" (12). The Trust's staff "met with "historians, educators, directors, conservators, librarians, and media specialists...to identify the basic issues, problems, and aspirations of the visual arts field...[in order] to develop programs that would go beyond the reach of others..." (12). Williams then identified the resultant focus of this investigation, one of which being education, and he described reasons for the formation of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in 1982. In order to achieve the DBAE approach advocated by Getty, "a content-driven, sequentially developed curriculum designed and taught by qualified instructors" is required (13). "This view--long held by a small group of leading art educators is at the heart of ...DBAE" (13). He referred to the Center's activities and the introduction this year of a grant program to similarly assist other schools around the country. Regarding the Center's goals he cited a desire to create a "forum where interested groups and individuals can propose and debate a variety of solutions to the problems facing art education today" (13). He characterized the Center's programs as recognizing: "1) Extensive research should determine the feasibility of any commitment, 2) Research and development determine the best approach to moving ahead, 3) At best, results will come slowly, and 4) Evaluation, systematically included [in] each step...[will] assure that objectives are being achieved" (14). He concluded that "It is the private foundation that is unique in its flexibility and autonomy and has the potential of thinking long-term, establishing goals, focusing resources, and taking risks. It is then the responsibility of the private foundation to search for the interstices where the vision and impact of other forms of philanthropic activity are not likely to be felt" (14).

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin, and Margaret A. Thomas. Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production. An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Volume: 1 Comparing the Process of Change Across Districts. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, R-3161/1-JPG, December 1984.

This report was sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, an operating activity of the J. Paul Getty Trust. The content of this study was a cross-site analysis of seven school districts that exhibited programs of art history, art criticism and art production. The study was concerned with two aspects: (1)..."factors that generate support for a strong, substantive art education program in a district's curriculum and (2) ...factors [that] influence the willingness and ability of school districts and teachers to carry out and maintain a discipline-based art education program" (xv). This volume "identifies the commonalities across research sites and compares the process of change in [the] seven selected districts. It discussed factors associated with sustaining quality art education programs in view of declining student enrollments, shrinking school budgets, and emphasis on basic reading an computational skills" (iii). The study's six sections describe: "Study Premise and Purpose, Study Design, Initiation, Implementation, Institutionalization, and Conclusions and Recommendations" (xxiii-xxiv). Three characteristics that were identified by the research as being found in "viable, academically, respectable programs" were: "an articulated conceptual base, a written curriculum and one that is sequential" (45).

Day, Michael., et al. Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production. An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Volume: II Case Studies of Seven Selected Sites. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, R-3161/2-JPG, December 1984.

This report was prepared for the Getty Center for Education in the Arts of the J. Paul Getty Trust. This volume "compiles the case reports of seven sites selected for an in-depth examination of art education programs that include art production, art history, and art criticism" (xv). "The study had two important purposes": (1)..."to determine whether the approach to visual arts education adopted by the Getty was being practiced in school districts from kindergarten through twelfth grade and (2)...to learn more about the character of these programs from an in-depth study of each" (v). "Each study illuminates the characteristics of the art program as well as the personalities that have shaped it" (iii). Written by educators, the case studies are described in the following parts: "I. Theory into Practice: The Whitehall [Ohio] Story (Marjorie Wilson); II. The District That Could: Art Curriculum implementation in Hopkins, Minnesota (Michael Day); III. Art Education in the Palo Alto [CA] Public Schools (Elliot W. Eisner); IV. An Illinois Pair: A Case Study of School Art in Champaign and Decatur (Robert E. Stake; V. Another view From the Bridge: School Art Programs in Brooklyn District 15 (Marjorie Wilson); VI. Diversity and Innovation: Art Education in the Milwaukee Public Schools (Michael Day); and VII. Tight Structure, Discipline and Quality: Art Education in Virginia Beach (Brent Wilson)" (xxv).

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin., Margaret A. Thomas, and Joyce Peterson. Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production. An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Disticts, Volume: III Executive Summary. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, R-3161/3-JPG, December 1984.

This report was sponsored by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, of the J. Paul Getty Trust. The report summarized the studies of the cross-site analysis (Vol. I) and case reports (Vol. II) of seven school districts that "tried to provide balanced instruction in art criticism, art history, and art production" (iii). The summary was divided into four sections. In Section I. "Introduction and Summary" three major conclusions are stated: 1). "the change to a discipline-based art program requires more than a change in policies and practices--it requires a shift in perspective"; 2). "to ensure the continuing integrity of these programs, district policies will have to include extensive in-service teacher training; a prescriptive, comprehensive curriculum; and classroom review by district representatives;" and 3). "programs must have politically adept advocates to generate interest in change....moral and financial support of district and school administrators, and the support and commitment of teachers, parents, and students, at every stage of change." Also, district-level art specialists are critical to the programs "viability, consistency, and quality" (3-4). In Section II. "Critical Factors in Changing Art Education were delineated (5-11). Section III. covered "Issues Exemplified by the Case Studies" by brief descriptions of the seven sites and in Section IV. the "Issues Surrounding A Substantive Art Program" were explored (12-20).

McFee, June K. "An Analysis of the Goal, Structure, and Social Context of the 1965 Penn State Seminar and the 1983 Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts." Studies in Art Education 25.4 (Summer 1984): 276-280.

In this paper, McFee compared the goals, structure, influences and contributions of the 1965 Penn State Seminar for Research in Art Education (Mattil, 1966) and the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts based on the Interim Report, 1983. She stated at the outset that although she had attended the Penn State Seminar she had "only read" the Getty Institutes' Interim Report. (276). She reported that the Penn State Seminar: had a main goal which "was to generate quality research in art education" (276); "was structured on invitational papers from...scholars...(277); "was planned and carried out during a period of social optimism" (278); and "contributed to the profession as a whole" (279). McFee read the Interim Report and believed that the key goal "was to demonstrate to the...public, and education establishment in particular, that art is a discipline that can be successfully taught in elementary schools, if teachers, administrators,...school boards are educated to understand the value and content of the discipline of art" (277). She asserted that "a clearly stated position is taken that the structure of art as a discipline includes only art history, art criticism, studio production, and aesthetic perception" (277). She reviewed the establishment of the Institute by the director and "his advisors and faculty" which took "a year" (278). McFee "hoped that the generative aspects involved in...[the Institutes' program] formulation...will be available for the theorists and researchers in the field" (278). She claimed that the Institute took a "particular position" and is an example of "one specified application of one definition of art and of education to curriculum and practice" (280, 281).

Greer, W. Dwaine and Jean C. Rush. "A Grand Experiment: The Getty Institutes for Educators on the Visual Arts." Art Education 38.1 (Jan. 1985): 24, 33-35.

Greer, Director of the Getty Institute of Educators for the Visual Arts and Rush, an Institute consultant explained the activities of the 1983 and 1984 Institutes. The authors suggested that the discipline-based approach corresponds with ideas found in art education literature "for the past 100 years" (24). They submitted that four "concepts and skills" are part of a discipline-based art curriculum, i.e. "aesthetic", "critical", "historical" and "productive" (24). They clearly believed that discipline-based art education has to be included in a persons general education. Both the 1983 and 1984 Institutes consisted of two parts: (1) "summer staff-development programs" which included school district "teams" of elementary classroom "teachers, superintendents, school board members and policy makers (24, 33). As part of the programs, principles and teachers "practiced aesthetic scanning" and viewed the use of the SWRL Elementary Art Program (1981)--a type of disciplined-based curriculum (33). (2) "year-long curriculum implementation programs" including assistance by Getty Center and Institute staffs to the district schools (24, 34). As of the publication of this article, the authors expected that evaluation of the Institutes would be completed by the end of 1985. They did find that teachers and principles clearly valued the opportunity for gallery visits and formal presentations. Appropriate follow-up and modification of the Institute concept will continue and may serve as a model elsewhere.

Getty Institute For Educators On The Visual Arts. "Executive Summary." Final Report: Institute '83, July 1, 1982--June 30, 1984. Dec. 1984.

In the report from the Getty Center for Education in Arts, the compilers stated that "art education should be approached as a subject of study, with a sequential curriculum that integrates instruction in art history, art criticism, studio production, and aesthetics. That is, instruction in art should be based on the structure of the discipline--that distinctive body of content and process relevant to the nature of art" (1). The report noted that the basis for the planning of the Getty Institute was "The decision to focus on discipline-based instruction coupled with research findings on how curriculum change in schools is best achieved..." (1). One of the determinants in choosing the Institute faculty and consultants was "their advocacy of the stance that art education should be offered as a subject discipline and include regular, sequential instruction" (3). The compilers pointed out that through DBAE it was expected "that students would develop a group of common art learnings drawn from experiences with the historical/cultural, aesthetic, creative-productive and critical dimensions of art." (6) An evaluation of the Institute by the compilers was created from three distinct sources: "three reports of the external evaluator, Dr. Ralph Hoepfner; a report on the curriculum implementation phase by Dr. Blanche Rubin, art educator; and a summary of invited observers' comments on the '83 Summer Staff Development Program" (8). In referring to the methodology of Hoepfner's evaluation of student achievement, the compilers pointed out that it consisted of "A battery of short, norm-referenced subtests in six different levels [and] covered the K-8 span of elementary grades...[and that] the more and better that teachers implemented art instruction, the higher their students' art achievement rose" (11-12). Twenty policies for future Institutes were also listed. The Institute as "a five-year model for district implementation of DBAE" will continue to be "refined" (23). DBAE instruction for "at least one hour a week in all the classrooms of a district"...was also an Institute aim (23).

Greer, W. Dwaine. "DBAE Student Achievement Tests." Abstracts of Research Presentations. Dallas: National Art Education Association, 1985.

In this paper, Greer reviewed the "development, administration and evaluation" by Dr. Ralph Hoepfner of achievement tests for elementary students engaged in DBAE through the 1983 Getty Institute (63). Hoeffner's norm-referenced subtests covered 6 levels and "measured knowledge and skills" in the 4 "subdisciplines" (63). He noted that the design of the tests paralleled "standardized tests used in other subject areas" (63). Subtests "included a variety of high-quality images across a wide range of art forms and origins" (63). He related that "1,117 completed booklets" were returned along with "teacher comments" and that those "comments were used to help [with] test revision" (63). Greer stated, " In general, the tests provided a reliable and valid assessment of students' achievement in art "(63). Also noted was the evaluator's conclusion "that we can make cautious claims that art can be taught as an educational discipline, with achievement related directly to the instructional activities of teachers, who...gained their skills from the Getty Institute" (63). Greer concluded that "the various subtests that comprise The Getty Summer Institute Art Survey do not presently meet psychometric standards set for the guidance or individual assessment of children. However, they are suitable for the testing of programs and groups. The Survey is an innovative...effort that should be improved and further developed as the work of the Institute proceeds" (63).

Greer, W. Dwaine. "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study." Studies in Art Education 25.4 (Summer 1984): 212-218.

Greer, Director of the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, presented an analysis of the background and history of discipline-based art education. He stated that discipline-based art education is a process that "should produce educated adults who are knowledgeable about art and its production and responsive to the aesthetic properties of works of art and other objects" (212). He noted that literature in art education for some 20 years has supported the direction towards this approach. In this article he referred to this approach as "discipline-based art education" (212). He used knowledge gained from past participation in the SWRL Elementary Art Program (1982) (an outgrowth of a curriculum project) and the Aesthetic Eye Project (Hine et al., 1976) (a project in staff-development) (213). Greer stated that the principles involved with the discipline-based approach will continue to develop. He cited many art educators who have considered the approach evident in this article. He affirmed Broudy's (1983) ideas that the "focus of discipline-based art instruction is art as a discipline within general education" (213). For him, the four disciplines (i.e., studio art, art history, aesthetics and art criticism) are but one approach to art education. Greer described seven distinguishing aspects of disciplined-based art education: 1) focusing on "the intrinsic value of art study"; 2) presenting "art education within the larger context of aesthetic education"; 3) "developing abilities to make expressive forms, to attend to works of art in recognized and shared ways, and to place them in their historical and cultural contexts"; 4) a "written curriculum" that is systematic and sequential; 5) "concepts and skills" from the four role models that are "taught concurrently, [and] they interrelate to reinforce one another"; 6) "attention to systematic instruction with time requirements"; and 7) "attention to outcomes" (214-217). In concluding, he suggested that teacher accountability is possible, for "it is easy to point to the knowledge and skills that students are acquiring...[for] When justifications for art education are made in terms of increasing competency rather than enjoyment, school people and parents look at art as a legitimate subject of instruction" (217).

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools. Los Angeles, CA: J. Paul Getty Trust, April 1985.

In this report, the Center introduced and supported its conclusions favoring discipline-based art education and referred to it as "a new concept for teaching art in America's schools that is gaining acceptance in art and educational communities across the country...[and referred to] Seven case studies, of selected school districts...[that] support the assumption that art is basic to education" (titlepage). Following the descriptions of the programs of these seven districts the report summarized what the Center believed to be the "critical elements" that are necessary for changing art education. (54) The Rand Corporation's conclusions submitted to the Center and derived from these seven school districts are also summarized. The Center noted that the findings of its research "lead the Getty to conclude that if art education is to move from the sidelines of instruction to a more central place in a balanced school curriculum, its content needs to be expanded to include attention to the disciplines that contribute to understanding art..."(v) The report also included the educational rationales of "Dr. Ernest Boyer, Mr. William Kieschnick and Dr. William Eisner" (iv).

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Proceedings Report "Beyond Creating: Roundtable Series." Getty Center for Educ. in the Arts, n.d.

This report from the Getty Center for Education in the Arts summarized and documented the proceedings of a roundtable series which had been sponsored by the Center. The following four roundtables covering the indicated topics were discussed: "Roundtable I: Boston, Massachusetts (October 28, 1985) 'Academic Rigor and the Development of Written, Sequential Curricula for Discipline-Based Art Education', Roundtable II: Seattle, Washington (December 3, 1985) 'The Role of the Art Education Advocate', Roundtable III: New Orleans, Louisiana (April 3, 1986) 'The Place for Creative Expression in a Discipline-Based Art Education Curriculum' and Roundtable IV: Chicago, Illinois (May 1, 1986) 'Resources--Financial and Administrative--for a Discipline-Based Art Education Program'. (1) In this documentation it was noted that "an average of forty invited guests attended....[and that] The purpose of...[the] meetings was to gather feedback from art and education specialists who were asked to read and react to [the Center's report] Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools" (1).

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. "Discipline-Based Art Education: What Forms Will It Take?" National Invitational Conference. Los Angeles: Getty Center for Educ. in the Arts, Jan. 1987.

In this conference report the Getty Center For Education in the Arts outlined the proceedings of the conference to review "new directions in visual art education" (iv). The Center pointed out its belief "that some variation on what is ...[DBAE] may be an appropriate response to the call for greater academic rigor..." (iv). The Center further suggested its beliefs "that there are a number of promising ways to establish DBAE programs in schools, and [that] individual forms of DBAE may be tailored to specific districts and geographic areas' (iv). Regarding the make-up and nature of the conference, the Center suggested that it "brought together art educators, educational leaders, school administrators, artists, elected official and others from across the country--over four hundred in all--to discuss the many complex issues involved in its implementation, and the forms it may ultimately take" (iv). The Center was not alone in staging this conference, for as the Center noted "Twenty-nine prestigious cooperating organizations...provided their ideas for the conference agenda as well as their support" (v). In this regard Duke credited the "regional roundtables and meetings with the cooperating organizations...[as being] instrumental in forming the agenda..." and noted that "many of the issues and concerns expressed in those forums Center confirmed its "conviction that discipline-based art education can and will take many forms in schools around the country...[and that] it "does not advocate one prescriptive method for implementing the concept" (2). Keynote addresses presented at the conference were as follows: Elliot W. Eisner ("Structure and Magic in Discipline-Based Art Education"); US Secretary Of Education William J. Bennett ("Address to the Getty Center Conference on Art Education"); Ernest L. Boyer ("The Arts, Language, and the Schools"); and Francis S. M. Hodsell ("Address to the Getty Center Conference on Art Education"). Panel presentations included "Art Production", "Art History", "Art Criticism", and "Aesthetics" (22-28); "Advocating DBAE" (56); "Components of a DBAE Program" (70); "The Role of Creativity in DBAE" (80); and DBAE's Impact on Museum Education" (88).

Eisner, Elliot. The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools. Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Center for Educ. in the Arts, n.d.

Eisner's paper, also printed in Art Education (Sept. 1987), discussed aspects of art education and DBAE under three broad headings: "The Arts and the Mission of Education; The Status of Art in the Schools and What is Discipline-Based Art Education?" (1, 10, 14). He reviewed various purposes of the arts in school and claimed that "The arts,...provide children with opportunities to use their imagination, to create multiple solutions to problems, and to rely on their own judgment to determine when a problem is solved...(7). He contended that one of the reasons art had a "marginal position" in schools was due to the the belief "art was not so much taught as caught" through the use of varied media (12). Eisner discussed the content of the four disciplines and submitted that although DBAE "has no interest in 'producing' professional aestheticians, it is interested in encouraging students to join in the continuing conversation about the nature and meaning of art in life" (20). Eisner stated that "there is no ideal...ratio to prescribe how much emphasis should be devoted to each discipline at any particular grade level. Such decisions are best left to the teacher, as long as it is understood that all four are important, but need not be taught as independent curricular strands. In the end, what receives emphasis will depend upon the teacher's professional judgment" (27).

Broudy, Harry S. The Role of Imagery in Learning, Occasional Paper 1. Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Center for Educ. in the Arts, 1987.

In this monograph by Harry S. Broudy, the Center presented the first in this series by "eminent scholars and practitioners in art, art criticism, art education, art history and aesthetics ...[which will] present ideas that will illuminate and inform the theory and practice of discipline-based art education" (5). Broudy noted that "The role of images is the theme of this essay. It will be discussed as it appears in various styles of teaching: in problem solving, in value education, and in the learning of language" (8). Broudy suggested that "if imagery affects life and learning to the extent that this essay claims, then the skills of perceiving aesthetic images should be a major focus of instruction in the elementary grades in conjunction with performance skills" (49). He stated that "(1) proper aesthetic perception unlike the ordinary variety, has to be especially attentive to the sensory content of the image and (2) the skills of perception can be taught to all normally educable pupils by classroom teachers after a relatively short training period" (49). He submitted that "There is no mystery about teaching these skills of aesthetic impression, nor is there [any mystery] in devising tests to assess progress in sensitivity in the perception of these properties" (50). Broudy stated that with brief in-service training elementary teachers can master "aesthetic scanning" (50). He asserted that aesthetic scanning consists of two parts with various subparts, i.e.: I. Aesthetic Perception, A. Sensory Properties, B. Formal Properties, C. Expressive Properties, and D. Technical Properties; II. Aesthetic Criticism, A. Historical, b. Recreative, and C. Judicial.

Clark, Gilbert A., Michael D. Day, and D. Dwaine Greer. "Discipline-based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art." Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 129-193.

The authors, commissioned by the Getty Center, explained in this paper "the ideas that describe and define DBAE" (135). They stated that "The explication of this theory and its identification by a recognizable and descriptive name are steps toward a general shift in the curricula and practices of art education" (131). They compared the "Discipline-centered Reform Movement" of the 60s to DBAE and indicated the areas DBAE has tried to avoid (133). DBAE also was compared to the "Creative Self-expression approach (134). The authors divided the paper into sections "organized around the defining characteristics of a DBAE program" and examined each characteristic (135). Limitations of the paper were stated. Sections, the defining characteristics, and selected descriptions follow: **I. Art as an Essential Subject in General Education** Characteristic 1. The goal of discipline-based art education is to develop student's abilities to understand and appreciate art. This involves a knowledge of the contexts and theories of art and abilities to respond to as well as to create art. Characteristic 2. Art is taught as an essential component of general education and as a foundation for specialized art study. **II. Art Disciplines and Art Education** Characteristic 3. Content for instruction is derived primarily from the disciplines of aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production. Short descriptions of the disciplines were presented by the authors who wrote separate papers on them in this issue. Brief examples of how each disciplines' content could be used in the classroom is stated by Clark et al. Characteristic 4. Content for study is derived from a broad range of the visual art including folk, applied, and fine arts from Western and non-Western cultures and from ancient to contemporary times. **III. Art Curricula for Students of Art** Characteristic 5. Curricula are written with sequentially organized and articulated content at all grade levels. They referred to curriculum as "a series of art lessons, actual written plans with objectives, motivation and learning activities, and methods of evaluation" (165). Characteristic 6. Works of art are central to the organization of curricula and to integration of content from the disciplines. They stated "that some of the same images should be used at each level..." (171). Characteristic 7. Curricula are structured to reflect comparable concern and respect for each of the four art disciplines. "Balanced treatment" among the 4 disciplines is a goal but that doesn't mean "...equal school time spent on each discipline at each grade level", the authors explained. (171,172). Also, since "art production activities...take more time to accomplish...art production might require a larger share of class time" (172). Characteristic 8. Curricula are organized to increase student learning and understanding. This involves a recognition of appropriate developmental levels. **IV. Art in Every Classroom** Characteristic 9. Full implementation is marked by systematic, regular art instruction on a district-wide basis, art education expertise, administrative support, and adequate resources. Characteristic 10. Student achievement and program effectiveness are confirmed by appropriate criteria and procedures. They hoped for "scholarly discussion and criticism of the issues raised in this paper" (182).

Spratt, Frederick. "Art Production in Discipline-based Art Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 187-204.

Spratt, commissioned by The Getty Center, first stated his view of the rationale for art production in schools. He wrote, "Our 'thinking' is increasingly being molded by the direct perception of images" [from the mass media] (197). He felt all students need to be visually literate. Spratt stated that when students create art they obtain "certain insights into...their own work and the world as well" (198). Also, he felt "empathy", is developed by the experience of creating art (198). Under the section Concepts and Skills in Art Production, he described 5 of the many processes involved in producing art: "rational thought", "heightened perception", "individual attitudes and feelings", "imagination", and "the artist's activity" (199). He stated that whether an artist chose an "abstract" or "figurative" "path" "certain formal elements... are common to any course" (200). He defined the "formal elements of visual art [as] (color, space, line, scale, shape, surface...) (200). He affirmed the importance of craft and technique in art objects and asserted that through the use of materials and tools the maker of the object could gain "self-confidence, care, skill and an... appreciation of nuance in fine work" (201). Spratt felt "art education, especially at the secondary level, should ensure that the newer visual media--photography, film, video, and the computer--are included in its content" (202). He concluded by describing how each of the other 3 disciplines could interrelate with art production: with art history--to "motivate", and to "recognize precedents to guide new effort"; with art criticism--"to inquire into the meaning of both... [contemporary works of art] and their own"; with aesthetics--to "reflection about the presence or absence of aesthetic qualities in their own work" (203, 204).

Kleinbauer, W. Eugene. "Art History in Discipline-based Art Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 205-215.

As a writer commissioned by The Getty Center, the author stated that art history should be "introduced" to students in the primary schools and be part of the "core curriculum" at the secondary level (205). He explained the reasons for requiring art history, e.g. it "teaches young people... to become [visually] literate about the visual world"; and it "teaches us that the great masters have always used sources" (206, 207, 208). Under the section Concepts and Skills of Art History, he defined the discipline and stated that art historians seek to "describe, analyze, and interpret individual works of art by identifying their materials and modes of production, their makers, their time and place of creation, and their meaning or function--in short, their place in the scheme of history" (209). He explained the 2 methods of art historical inquiry: the "intrinsic" which "focuses on [the] intrinsic factors" [of] connoisseurship; style; iconography; and function and the "extrinsic" which examined and interprets the extrinsic factors of "artistic biography; psychoanalysis and Gestalt and Jungian psychology; semiotics; etc. (209). He advocated that secondary students "can acquire the rudiments of art history" and that "in the 10th and 11th grades, they could... be exposed to selected intrinsic and extrinsic methods..." (210). He did not recommend "comprehensive surveys of Western art history" be given in the high school (211). Kleinbauer concluded his paper with examples of ways the other 3 disciplines are complemented and/or similar/different from each other--with respect to art production: "if there had been no art production in the past, there would...be no art history"; aesthetics: both are interested in the "interrelationships" among the arts but differ in intent; art criticism: both "interpenetrate and complement each other". Often critics and historians might use similar approaches although, "as a general rule,... contemporary art historians seldom assume the role of judicial art critics" (211, 212, 214).

Risatti, Howard. "Art Criticism in Discipline-based Art Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 217-225.

In this paper, commissioned by The Getty Center, Risatti asserted that art and art education are not only about the "creation and study of beauty" but also include the "cognitive and social functions of art" (218). He stated that "the importance and meaning of the things society endeavors to do reflect society's underlying values system" (217). He explained that art criticism "seeks to inform and educate people... about art by providing insights into its meaning so as to increase the understanding and appreciation of art and to illuminate the cultural and societal values reflected in it" (219). Criticism focuses, he stated, on contemporary and modern art, "which are linked to the values and objectives of the present" (220). Under Concepts and Skills in Art Criticism, he stated that attempts to discuss the meaning of works of art must be based on critical commentary formed in perception of the work and issues related to the work" (220). He identified 2 components used in the critical process. The first dealt with the "internal visual aspects of the work of art" and consisted of using the skills of "descriptive and formal analysis" (221). Descriptive analysis "is concerned with the recognition and description of the visual elements [the literal subject matter] that compose the work of art" (221). Formal Analysis "means developing the ability to see visual relationships among shapes, forms, lines, and colors" (221). He explained the second component as being a "question of significance or meaning" which consisted of 2 types of discussion of meaning: "internal and external" (222). "Discussions of internal qualities focus on a work's inherent aspects and may be iconographic, narrative, symbolic, etc." (222). "Discussions of external qualities view the work within a larger context, such as art-historical... historical; psychological...etc." (222). Risatti then described the levels at which students could be expected to use the 2 components. He explained the interrelationships between art criticism and the other 3 disciplines and stated that "skill in formal and descriptive analysis of works of art is essential for any of these disciplines" (224).

Crawford, Donald W. "Aesthetics in Discipline-based Art Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 227-239.

Crawford, commissioned by The Getty Center, stated that the term "aesthetics is conceived somewhat more broadly" than being the "philosophy of the beautiful" and that now "aesthetic inquiry...has become essentially the philosophy of art" (227, 228). He felt that aesthetics is "designed to broaden perspectives and to develop critical skills" and thus can be part of primary and secondary education (228). Crawford stated that "Although philosophers... disagree on the nature of their discipline and its proper methods... they concur that philosophy is a reflective or deliberate inquiry... (228). "The basic presupposition of aesthetics...is that our experiences of art--creating, appreciating, criticizing--involve basic human values and...are worthy of serious inquiry" (228). Under Concepts and Skills in Aesthetics he analyzed the "five main clusters of concepts to which aestheticians direct their attention and which.... define the discipline: (1) the art object, (2) appreciation and interpretation, (3) critical evaluation, (4) artistic creation, and (5) the cultural context" (231). Crawford discussed how aesthetic inquiry could occur in the classroom at different levels of complexity, such as, "First-graders...[could] begin to reflect on their reasons for liking the things they make" (236). He explained that philosophical inquiry entails expository methods which cause the comparison, and "reformulation of views" which are...tested by the critical scrutiny of the teacher or the students...(237). He acknowledged that teachers would know at what level certain issues could be raised with students. Regarding aesthetics and DBAE, Crawford stated that "Aesthetics being the critical reflection on art, relies on art production and appreciation and the disciplines of art history and art criticism for its subject matter" (238). He concluded that "the integration of aesthetics into art education curricula need not proceed through the systematic study of the aesthetic theories of the past" but that some attention could be given them at advanced levels (238).

Feldman, David Henry. "Developmental Psychology and Art Education: Two Fields at the Crossroads." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 243-259.

In this paper, commissioned by The Getty Center, Feldman asserted that changes are occurring in both art education and developmental psychology and that "new theoretical developments" in developmental psychology may be very useful to art education (243). He described features of traditional developmental theories (the "universalist" approach) (245). He cited reasons educators in the past adopted the universal developmental view and the results of it and noted that educators might now be suspicious toward developmental psychology helping them. Feldman stated that "the most important change in developmental theory...[that] occurred in the past decade...is the distinction...between universal and nonuniversal development... [which] attempts to separate those aspects of human change and transformation that are essentially inevitable and will occur in all children, regardless of background and experience, from those aspects that require the systematic application of cultural resources and effort by those who seek to facilitate developmental change" (247). He acknowledged the importance of universal developmental theories and suggested their use "as a general guide to what can reasonably be expected to work with children of a given age or grade level" (249). He described a "Universal-to-Unique Continuum..." (Figure 1.) which portrays a child's cognitive development (250). Feldman recognized that with young children "It would take considerable ingenuity to find ways to make art history, aesthetics, and art criticism of sufficient interest...to catch their attention even momentarily" (250). Feldman further examined 5 "provisionally established" principles which were derived from research on developmental change in nonuniversal domains (253). He reiterated that this article had at its basis much of his own work and that "more specificity will be needed in both theory and research. Virtually none of the research to date has been done in art education..."(257).

Part III. A summary of developing issues in DBAE.

Hamblen, Karen A. "An Examination of Discipline-Based Art Education Issues." Studies in Art Education 28.2 (Winter 1987): 68-78.

Hamblen suggested that although DBAE continues to be developed, she proposed in this paper to discuss issues "within the four general categories of conceptual structure, curriculum selections, research foundations, and organizational affiliations" and she felt most issues "appear to be matters of pedagogy" (68). She asserted that DBAE doctrines follow the model of "technocratic rationalism" which is "characterized by content that is standardized; efficiency of means is emphasized, behaviors are routinized, and outcomes are predefined" (69). She then reviewed some aspects of Greer's (1984) definition of DBAE an pointed out that in the Getty Center research project "only two district wide programs were found that could clearly be considered discipline-based" (Beyond Creating, 1985) [Getty Center, 1985] (69). She claimed that "definitions of DBAE are,...prescriptive rather than descriptive of extant programs and the language used serves to emphasize DBAE's similarities to other subjects in general education" (69). With respect to teaching a DBAE curriculum, she asserted that "Paradoxically, integrating the four areas may be DBAE's most potent selling point in that it will allow teachers to continue to build their curricula round the making of art. Integration may actually serve to obscure and make more palatable DBAE's radical departure from the past while undermining DBAE's own goals" (70). She discussed the difficulty of identifying and sequencing art content. Hamblen pointed out the problems of including aesthetics in DBAE. Aesthetic scanning, as an art criticism procedure, she noted, "is presented as correct rather than as a choice among many possibilities" (72). She found curriculum materials indicitative of technocratic rationalism also. Since evaluation of student achievement is a characteristic of DBAE she was concerned that standardized testing would become the most common type of DBAE evaluation format. She found it "often unclear whether proponents of DBAE are acting as individuals or as spokespersons for the Getty Center" (75). She claimed that "Little critical dialogue on DBAE appears in the literature" (75). Also she cautioned that "DBAE needs to be presented as one approach by which art can be studied as a discipline....and that "Research on teaching art as a discipline needs to be funded and conducted so that it does not prescribe a specific solution" (76).

MacGregor, Ronald N. "An Outside View of Discipline-based Art Education." Studies in Art Education 26.4 (Summer 1985): 241-246.

MacGregor, a Canadian art educator, acknowledged that any faulty opinions are based on his "private perceptions or with their [Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts] public image" (241). He commented on three areas. Under "Nature and Scale of the Project" he stated that the 1983 Institute's philosophy was similar to that of Barkan's (1966) proposal which "mentioned three roles for the student: producer, historian, critic. "The dimension added to the present Getty program, the role of aesthetician, is less easy to visualize as a separate domain" (242). He remarked "One day someone may write an account of the deliberations of the Institute's six initial faculty members, and give some indication of the arguments presented for and against inclusion of the aesthetic domain as a domain" (243). Under "Perceived Problems in Development and Implementation" he questioned whether "national coverage" of the Getty Institute program could occur now and suggested they would do well to provide "some examples to which all can aspire,..." (245). Before he discussed the "Possibility of Establishing Discipline-Based Art Education, he asserted that "the continuing absence of agreement on what constitutes a discipline makes these four [aesthetics, studio art, art history, and art criticism] contenders as valid as any other. It should not be assumed...that they carry anything more that the force of argument" (245). After he defined the term "discipline", he agreed that three of the four would fit within the definition but "Studio art is altogether an unlikely candidate for discipline statue, since its content is not clearly demarcated, and its techniques often are not rule-governed" (245).

Hausman, Jerome J. "Another View of Discipline Based Art Education." Art Education 40.1 (Jan. 1987): 56-60.

Hausman, commenced his analysis by acknowledging that "Terms such as 'basics'(sic) 'accountability,' 'learning outcome.' (sic) and 'school management'...[are] in vogue" with regard to art education (56). While he acknowledged that it is difficult to argue "against efforts to foster disciplined behaviors...for we are all for disciplined behavior" (57), he found it difficult to agree upon what exactly are the "'parent disciplines' that need to be taught in certain specified ways" (57-58). He cautioned that given the trend to try and equate art education "as being the same as other academic subjects it is important to beware that we are not selling our souls or catering to values alien to the very disciplined behaviors we seek to encourage" (58). He suggested in this regard that there was further work necessary to decipher the meaning of the term "discipline" when used in regard "to the teaching of art" (58). In a departure from the four discipline mode of DBAE, Hausman asserted that the disciplines of the teaching of art should be part of a "multi-disciplined base" which for him would include: "studio practice, art history, aesthetics, art criticism, psychology, philosophy, history, literature, science--indeed the full range of our human knowledge" (58). He questioned how a teacher could cover all the content of these disciplines and concluded that the individual teacher would "shape the content for instruction using his or her own experience and the context of the classroom situation---the developmental and cultural priorities of students as well as the available teaching resources and time" (58). Hausman claimed that it is necessary to have "art specialists at all grade levels to work with teachers and students in planning and carrying out programs...[and that it was unwise] to make art like other disciplines...[with] greater rigidities and a more intimidating climate...' (59) In closing he reiterated the need to meld together the teacher's abilities, the characteristics of the students, and what resources there are to work with.

Chalmers, F. Graeme. "Beyond Current Conceptions Of Discipline-Based Art Education." Art Education 40.5 (Sept. 1987): 58-61.

Chalmers asserted that "...the current conceptions of discipline-based art education smack of four narrow specialisms..." (58). He offered a remedy to such limitations "...by adding the disciplines and perspectives of the social sciences, particularly anthropology and sociology" (58). He evaluated the Getty Center's approach to DBAE and complained that "By having excluded sociologists, anthropologists, and scholars in cultural studies, the Getty Center seems to imply that understanding and and appreciation of art is both completely independent of... [such fields of study]" (60). He seemed particularly bothered by his conclusion that the Getty Center approach left the definition of what really is or is not a "work of art" to "contemporary artists, art historians, philosophically oriented aestheticians, museum curators, and directors of art galleries..." (60). He found support for his complaint with the work of "European scholars and the art educators... [who] argue that the study of art must be unbiased and interdisciplinary and that the dominance of any one discipline...is an obstacle to its development" (60). In concluding his analysis, Chalmers suggested that any "understanding of art" must be accomplished "in its full complexity" (61).

Gray, James U. "A Seventy-Five Percent Solution for the Success of DBAE." Art Education 40.5 (Sept. 1987): 54-57.

Gray acknowledged his appreciation of the role of DBAE within the art education field in terms of "a re-focusing of our goals" but he claimed a "weakness in DBAE formulation....exists through the inclusion of aesthetics as a discrete area of study" (54). He asserted that "Elementary school pupils,...do not need to study aesthetics if their teacher has, and if the teacher is a successful transformative agent. Their art education will have implicitly entailed the study of aesthetics" (55). Gray claimed that his reason for excluding aesthetics as a separate area of study was not due to it being less important than the others (since he felt it is so involved in the "analysis" of the other 3 but that it would "...create an unnecessary diversion toward an artificial area for teachers to study in depth. We could be asking school teachers to move in where some philosophers fear to tread" (55). He contended "that the study of aesthetics would represent a misplaced emphasis if it were to be treated at the elementary school level as a philosophical venture" (56). He further claimed "that what teachers don't understand or can't readily transform, they will ignore...(56). He cited quotations from Greer (1984) and Eisner (1986) [sic] that indicated to him that they felt "...sensitive to aesthetics as a problematic element of DBAE" (56). He also indicated inconsistencies in Clark & Zimmerman's (1981) descriptions of the role of aestheticians. He cautioned that "by not clarifying possible misconceptions or complex form and matter relationships we might provoke negative reactions against a curriculum innovation that could generate constructive, qualitative art education" (57). He found it difficult to believe "...that teachers reading about DBAE are aware that the four-part description at its best is essentially an idealization" (57).

Summary

Part I. The Antecedents Of DBAE.

Efland (1987) reviewed the role of art in education and described the popular philosophy of art in the 1930s and 1940s as being "'creative self-expression', that it had therapeutic benefits, and that its purpose was to foster personal growth" (59). "Teachers... [he said] were advised to encourage child art as an untutored, spontaneous activity that came from the subconscious" (1987:60). This "psychological conception of art education" (3) was reflected in Smith's (1987) quotation of Viktor Lowenfeld's (1957:11) text to the effect that "art education may become the catalyst for a child-centered education in which the individual and his creative potentialities are placed above subject matter" (28). Sevigny (1987), in his survey of art teacher education courses and programs, noted the number of child-centered textbooks developed in the 1940s and stated that "Lowenfeld's text, Creative and Mental Growth (1947) was perhaps the most influential art education training textbook of the 1950s and 1960s" (98).

In his survey of curriculum documents, Kern (1987) found that from the 1930's to the 1960's, creative art experiences were the prevalent concern. Studio art and the manipulation of materials prevailed. Smith (1987) cited Barkan's (1962) analysis of these approaches as an example of the increasing criticism of the traditional art education field. Barkan (1962) noted that these approaches and beliefs were being challenged at recent art conferences "which have emphasized the return of art to art education..."(13). Influenced by Bruner's ideas from the "Woods Hole Conference of 1959", Barkan asserted "that there is a subject matter of the field of art,

and it is important to teach it" (1962:13, 14).

During the early 1960s Smith (1987) submitted (citing Barkan, 1963; Kaufman, 1963; Logan, 1963) that "writers began to think systematically about art education as a unique discipline and to reconceptualize its basic purposes and enterprise" (3). In papers initially presented at an art conference and then printed in a journal, the three writers debated the idea of art and whether or not there was a discipline of art education. Barkan (1963) outlined his belief that "Art education could become a discipline if it would develop a distinctive structure....[it] does have a history of ideas and a body of concepts....Lacking, however, is an appropriate and pervasive set of rules--a characteristic strategy and a consistent approach to whatever ultimate goals and purposes, position, or points of view to which art education would aspire" (4).

Kaufman (1963) on the hand stated that "It would be presumptuous to consider art education a discipline...[as] there is not characteristic and defining mode with which to identify it as a discipline" (15). He asserted that art "is still frequently treated as a 'frill and a fad'...and that "the whole area of art education has been faced with the need for reappraisal for quite some time" (15, 23). Logan posited that "'Yes, dear colleagues, there is a discipline of art education '" (10). After reviewing basic dictionary definitions of the term "discipline", he claimed that "art education is not a branch of knowledge or learning, but is, viewed in the broadest terms, at least a dualism of the knowledges of art and education" (10).

Efland (1987) noted the influence in the 1960's of Bruner's writings such as The Process of Education (1960) on curriculum

problems. He explained that "Bruner contended that the disciplines could be represented in some intellectually honest form to students at all levels of instruction and that these should be made the basis of the curriculum" (63). Efland described the influence of Bruner in the presentations of scholars at the Penn State Seminar (i.e., A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development in 1966) at Pennsylvania State University . He stated that "a pervasive theme of the seminar was the notion that art or art education is a discipline in its own right, with goals that should be stated in terms of their power to help students engage independently in disciplined inquiry in art" (64).

Barkan (1966) in his presentation, analyzed the involvement of theory in curricular problems and suggested that:

> The art educator cannot avoid theory, because he must be guided by it; hence, he must synthesize the knowledge in art of the artist, and the knowledges about art of the aesthetician, the critic and the historian. To the detriment of art education, however, we have anchored curriculum almost entirely in relation to the artist, only slightly in relation to the art historian; we have ignored the aesthetician and critic. Art curriculum is faltering, not because of efforts to attend to art history, but rather, because we have not learned to use the aesthetician and critic, nor do we properly use the art historian. (243)

With respect to Bruner's influence on curriculum, Barkan confirmed his belief that while in contrast to the sciences there may appear to be an "absence of a formal structure of interrelated theorems....the disciplines of art are of a different order" (244). He stated, "there are controls operating in competent work by artists,

critics and others engaged in art; and to this important extent, they engage in structured inquiry which is disciplined" (244).

Sevigny (1987) asserted "that the Penn State Seminar is regarded as a significant point of transition in the evolution of DBAE" and that "Barkan and Eisner...[Eisner also presented a paper on curriculum development] are most credited with building the conceptual foundation for new content for the historical, critical, and aesthetic domains of art study" (101).

Through the 1960s and 1970s many curriculum projects---some of which were a direct or indirect consequence of the Penn Seminar---were conducted. Efland (1987) described in detail the content of projects--and those involved---such as CEMEREL's Aesthetic Education Program (Barkan, Chapman and Kern, 1970); The Kettering Project (Eisner, 1969); The SWRL Elementary Art Program (Greer, Quellmalz, Allen, Duffey and Wilkes, 1972) and The Aesthetic Eye Project (Broudy 1972, Hine, Clark, Greer and Silverman, 1976). The projects differed in many ways (goals, sequence, etc.) but the common bond to DBAE was their attention to the areas of art history, art criticism and studio (86).

Sevigny (1987) suggested that the "reassessment of the 1960s helped to establish fresh enthusiasm and a new sense of purpose for art teacher education" (102). He looked for evidence of this purpose in undergraduate bulletins from 1960 to 1965 and found little evidence "to support any strong move to adopt the alternative values advocated at the Penn State seminar" (103). The bulletin content reflected "studio production and child-centered philosophy" (103). Art history was required with "no more than two to three survey-level courses";

aesthetics as a "course was found in only two programs and criticism was not mentioned at all (103). In the 1970s, "dominance of creative experimentation and child-centered theory" diminished (104). Course topics such ...aesthetic perception, the sociological and cultural dimensions of art... and art for the gifted and talented" appeared (104). Also he stated, "...at least one course in aesthetics or art criticism" was required (104).

Kern's (1987) review of state curriculum documents indicated little change toward attention to the four disciplines within the 1960s. He characterized the 1970s as the "dawning of discipline-base education" due to "a general and persistent concern" towards including the four disciplines (46). Kern found the Oregon guide, Elementary Art Education: A Handbook for Oregon Teachers" published in 1977 to be "an actual example of discipline-based art education"--all four disciplines receive attention (49). During this time also "a number of state...curriculum guides...promoted studio, critical, and historical activities" (50).

Smith (1987) reviewed theoretical antecedents in various areas (aesthetics, educational theory, educational psychology etc.) and he acknowledged within the area of art education the "gradual change in the image of the field" was "solidified in several substantive textbooks written by art educators in the 1970s" (20). Some of the textbooks he reviewed were: "Feldman's Becoming Human through Art (1970); Eisner's Educating Artistic Vision (1972); and Chapman's Approaches to Art in Education (1978)" (20, 21). Chapman, he noted "antedates the idea of discipline-based education" with her approach of " studio art, historical awareness, and critical appreciation" (21). He cited examples of research articles of the 70s and 80s which

also reflected a shift in the field especially in articles concerned with the areas of art criticism and art history.

Clark, Day & Greer (1987) mentioned the many writers who "moved the field consistently away from the creative self-expression approach" such as "Barkan, 1962; Eisner and Ecker, 1966; Day, 1969; E.B. Feldman, 1971; R.A. Smith, 1971; McFee, 1971; Eisner, 1969, 1972; Lanier, 1974; Efland, 1976; Hine, Clark, Greer, and Silverman, 1976; Chapman, 1978; Clark & Zimmerman, 1978, 1981" (133). Smith (1987) also noted that "aesthetic instruction expanded beyond what Efland (1976) called the style of school art to include perceptual skills, historical knowledge, and critical judgment needed to understand and appreciate works of mature art" when art educators realized the relevance of the various disciplines (4). Efland (1976) in his article analyzed "the school art style" and concluded that in the art taught in school, "there is little resemblance or relation between what professional artists do and what children are asked to do" (39). He asserted that "If artwork has a free and creative look, school persons can say life in school is not just a cognitive matter" (41).

Smith (1987) reiterated the importance to the field of the questioning during the 1960s of whether art was a discipline. He noted "with the emphasis provided by the back-to-basics and excellence-in-education movements...[that topic had] surfaced in the literature" (citing Clark & Zimmerman, 1981)" (20). Earlier in their 1978 article, Clark & Zimmerman were bothered by the various rationales used to justify art programs, none of which seemed related "to the real world of the arts and work of the artist" (34). Acknowledging the influence of the Penn State Seminar they added the

role of the aesthetician to the other roles and attempted "to establish a continuum of behaviors related to each role that would developmentally the learner from a naive to sophisticated understanding of each role" (35). They believed their model was the first of its kind. Detailed descriptions of each role including teacher tasks were developed. They recognized the role of Greer's ideas in certain aspects of the model.

In 1981, a less detailed version of the previous model was presented in the literature by Clark & Zimmerman. In their 1981 article they submitted that "Art is basic and essential in a curriculum that aims to develop in all students those social, personal, and cognitive skills necessary for responsible participation in a democratic society" (53). They also acknowledged the ideas of Barkan (1963) and urged the use of research to "define the relevant content for learning experiences in art" (55).

In assessing the 1980s with regard to teacher education, Sevigny (1987) reported that: art teacher enrollment in programs declined; studio production continued to be the prevalent content area with more variety in the courses offered; and "art teacher education methods courses" represent the "most significant shift toward DBAE" (107). He summarized the results of the survey over "the past 20 years" and found, "graduation requirements for art education programs have changed very little" (109). He asserted "that DBAE is at an impasse unless a major redesign of teacher education courses and requirements is implemented to realize the goals of DBAE" (109).

Kern's 1987 review of state curriculum documents during 1980-1984 indicated four goals found in the 1970s--those of "the perception of art, the making of art, art criticism, and art history" (50). He

characterized the emphasis of art history and art criticism in the 1980s as "a groundswell of support" towards "a more rigorous... approach to the teaching of art" (52). His conclusions based on the total survey were: "only studio art has been continuously present during the 110 years covered by the documents"; "art history (including picture study)" was included for most of the time studied; "art criticism has received curricular attention only during the past 15 to 20 years"; and aesthetics received "almost no educational attention" (52). He felt that since the indication that "teaching art solely for creativity and self-expression is in decline" and that "art history, art criticism,...[and] studio art, is increasingly mentioned in...recent curriculum documents....[it appears]...the field is adopting a more comprehensive and academic approach" (53). He questioned whether this approach will result in DBAE and suggested that it depended on "how well the objectives of this approach to art education are articulated and how closely these objective match the perceived needs of the field" (53).

Efland (1987) concluded his review of curriculum antecedents with a discussion of recommendations and issues such as: the need to include diverse educational goals in DBAE curricula; how to determine lesson order; difficulties over agreement of scholars about curriculum content; curriculum that correspond to the "realities of schooling"; and the need for "curriculum work done at the secondary level" (89, 90)

Smith (1987) reiterated that over the last 30 years, a general trend can be seen toward teaching something "formally or substantively about art" and that "there can doubtless be varieties of discipline-based education identified by different labels" outside the DBAE

definition by Clark et al. in 1987 (26). He suggested future research and study were needed with regard to: skills needed for "aesthetic and visual intelligence"; "uses of art history; and ways "disciplines of discipline-based art education interrelate" (27).

Dobbs (1988a), Editor of the newly published anthology of research studies on DBAE, also confirmed the changes in art education which lead to DBAE and claimed that research played a "significant role in... [its]...emergence..." (7) The 12 research articles in the anthology "represent the four art disciplines, the four types of research, and a spectrum of sources in which [the] research materials appear" (9). The articles are "chronologically rather than thematically grouped, to emphasize the evolution of the DBAE paradigm" (9). Except for the Greer (1984) article, the "readings focus upon issues related to discipline-based art education rather than address it directly" (8).

Clark et al., (1987) commenced an analysis of the shift in the art education field from the creative self-expression approach by asserting "that it was not until the mid-1980s,...that these early questions and suggestions, reinforced by 20 years of constructive criticism and scholarly writings, resulted in an alternative approach to art education" (133).

Part II. Research And Development Activities Of The Of The Getty Center For Education In The Arts.

Duke (1983), Director of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, reviewed the background and interest of J. Paul Getty in collecting works of art and displaying them in his museum. After Getty's death and when the administration of the Getty estate was concluded in 1982, the J. Paul Getty Trust ("a private operating foundation rather than a grants-making foundation") became responsible for spending "annually a minimum of 4 1/2% of the market value of its endowment..." (5). Duke (1983) said that, "the Trust will spend a significant amount of money annually on it operating activities--estimated to be between $50-60 million" (5). Davis (1988) explained that "The endowment is now valued at $3.3 billion... and that..."the trust must spend a minimum of 4.25 percent of the average annual market value of the endowment, which this year will work out to about $130 million" (4).

Williams (1987), The Trust's President and Chief Executive Officer, mentioned the Trust's preparatory evaluation of its future activities which began in 1981 with a "year-long investigation of the field" (12). Duke (1983) explained that the staff" met with hundreds of individuals" to assess visual art issues and needs (5). Then "groups of professionals from the fields of art history and scholarship, museums, and arts education" came to "respond to our findings" and "prioritize the needs" (5). Duke (1983) noted that some of the findings during the investigation regarding arts education programs in the public schools were: "emphasis in visual arts education on fostering creative expression and developing artistic skills, such as drawing, painting, [etc.]; Lack of recognition among

school policy makers and parents of the cognitive and affective contributions the arts make to educational development; College admission criteria, teacher certification requirement, standardized testing, and high school graduation requirement, which consistently exclude the arts...[and reinforce] the notion that the arts are not valuable to educational development or worthy of instructional time in the curriculum; [and] The absence of written, sequential, and substantive curricula that convey the content and processes of art and provide for cumulative learning" (McLaughlin and Thomas, 1984: iii-iv).

The Trust decided to support four specific activities which were described more fully by Duke (1983). Duke (1983) characterized one of the activities, The Center for Education in the Arts, as a "locus for coordinating activities" and not a "physical entity" (5). The "initial programs are conceived as research and development activities" (6). She stated that although "the Center...is conceived of as...embracing all of the arts disciplines...[their focus would be] initially on the visual arts" (6). Duke reiterated the Getty's commitment to contribute to knowledge about the visual arts and said that the "arts are fundamentally important to the development and vitality of a democratic society" (6). She felt that for change to occur in the perception and practice of art education in schools, "a more holistic approach to what is taught and how it is taught is needed" (6). She further suggested that " A human being is never adequately educated without having an opportunity to study the arts" and that "an arts education program should be included in the curriculum...taught in the same way as other academic subjects" (6).

She asserted that "Art education should be approached as a subject of study with a sequential curriculum that integrates instruction in art history and criticism, studio production, and aesthetic perception" (6).

Duke stated that four programs were underway, two of which were: 1) A "national research project" involving 7 school districts that are trying to provide programs in "art history, art criticism, art making, and aesthetic awareness"; and 2) A "school personnel development project--the "Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts" (6,7).

Duke explained the purpose of the national research project as understanding "the factors contributing to and constraining art education programs which attempt to provide regular instruction in art history, art criticism, art making, and aesthetic awareness" (6). Five educators and Rand Corporation analysts collaborated on the project. Initially, twelve sites were chosen for visits and out of those, seven sites became part of the study. Duke remarked that the findings, to be published in Spring 1984, should aid their planning and inform the art education field (6).

The Rand Corporation research study was published in December 1984 and was composed of three volumes: Volume I--Cross-site analysis of the seven school districts; Volume II--Case studies of the programs of the seven school districts; and Volume III--Summary of Volumes I and II. The study is based on district-wide programs encompassing three domains (art history, art criticism, and art production). In Volume I, McLaughlin & Thomas (1984) explained that since the site selection of the districts, "the thinking of the Getty Center has evolved to include four domains--separating the discipline of aesthetics from that of art history art criticism, and art production. (Aesthetics

means the study of the nature of art, the value of art, and its role in society.) However, this study did not systematically examine whether students in classrooms were exposed to aesthetics, and the model of the aesthetician is still not well-developed for us to know precisely what it means for schools and education; therefore, the content of this study addresses only the three domains" (4).

As summarized by McLaughlin & Thomas (1984), "of the seven programs studied, only two, in our estimation, were carried consistently into the classroom...." The elementary generalist teachers in Hopkins [MN] and the elementary and secondary art specialist teachers in Virginia Beach [VA] achieved parity among the three domains in their teaching of art" [parity means "equality in terms of the status or value accorded each of the domains...[it] does not mean equal instruction time" (13). They called the programs in the study "pioneers" since they were attempting programs that included the three domains (45). They stated their programs were "also unusual in the status accorded art education and given the conditions of the time, their "accomplishments" should not be "underestimated" (45). Duke agreed that the programs were promising even though "as committed as the seven districts are to discipline-based art education, there is little evidence of adequate instruction in art history and criticism" and few use "curricula...leading to cumulative learning at each grade level" (McLaughlin & Thomas 1984:v). She felt the research helped the districts and gave "insight into what art education can and should be" (McLaughlin & Thomas 1984:vi).

In Volume III, McLaughlin, Thomas & Peterson (1984), asserted that although each districts programs and resources are different, certain

factors are needed for change to occur, such as "an articulated conceptual base, a written curriculum and a sequential curriculum" (5). Factors for initiation, implementation and institutionalization of art programs were also given (6-11). They asserted that certain issues must be faced: "support for art education; the lack of model programs to guide development; professional development to support instruction and training; and the lack of a knowledge base to inform training, program development, and practice" (17). With respect to model programs, they conceded that few exist as their investigation showed. They indicated the value of models but cautioned that "one best model" could not "serve in every environment" (18). The various programs in this study demonstrated the diversity in program development which fit their locales.

The Center for Education in the Arts second research and development project was the Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts. Duke (1983) explained the pilot project as an effort "to provide teachers, administrators, and school policy makers with the information and skill necessary to develop and implement a visual art education program in their districts" (7). She explained two "premises" upon which the Institute was based: information from "studies about curriculum change in schooling" and realization that general classroom teachers will have to provide art instruction at the elementary level since there are few art specialists teaching at that level (7). After participating in the program, Duke expected that art education courses in their schools "will include instruction in art history, production, and criticism and will utilize community artists and art resources to complement and supplement classroom instruction" (7).

McFee (1984) in an article about the Getty Institute based on the Fall, 1983 Interim Report from the Institute, stated that "it appears that the central goal [of the 1983 Institute] was to demonstrate to the... public, and education establishment in particular, that art is a discipline that can be successfully taught in elementary schools, if teachers, administrators,...school boards are educated to understand the value and content of the discipline of art" (277). She asserted that "a clearly defined position is taken that the structure of art as a discipline includes only art history, art criticism, studio production, and aesthetic perception" (277).

The 1983 Interim Report was not available to the public according to Dobbs (1988b) who is Senior Program Officer of the Getty Center but the Executive Summary (Getty Institute 1984) was available. The Executive Summary Final Report: Institute '83 covered the time from July 1, 1982 to June 30, 1984, so it reflected the change to discipline-based art education (DBAE) which included aesthetics (1). Two of the four long-range goals of the Institute were to: "establish a view of art education that fosters the ability to understand and appreciate serious works of art, and the significance of art as an educative force and cultural necessity"; and "establish K-6 school district programs of regular art instruction with a balance in instructional time and content that includes..." [the four areas] (2).

The compilers of the report stated that the Institute began its activities in July 1982 with the appointment of Greer as Director" (1). "With the appointment of three Associate Directors to the Institute staff, the planning phase was underway by the fall of 1982. The staff was responsible for determining the Institute goals,

planning the program activities, and facilitating all logistical arrangements (2). They also met with Duke, Director of the Center for Education in the Arts. Greer, Visiting Professor of Art Education, University of Arizona was joined by 1983 Institute staff members--"Hine, Art Education Consultant Emeritus, Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools; Silverman, professor of Art, California State University, Los Angeles; and Zwissler, Director of the SWRL Center for Instruction in the Arts" (Duke 1983:7). The six faculty members were: Broudy, Chapman, Day, Eisner, Feldman, and Lanier. Seven consultants included: Anderson, Clark, Conant, Feinstein, Rush, Sharp, and Smith (Duke 1983:7). "Six members of the Institute faculty plus five persons experienced in school administration and policy matters and teacher education" compiled an advisory group (Getty Institute 1984:3).

Greer & Rush (1985) described the 1983 and 1984 Institutes which consisted of two parts: 1) "summer staff-development programs" which included school district "teams of teachers, superintendents, school board members and policy makers (24, 33) and 2) "year-long curriculum implementation programs" including assistance by Getty Center and Institute staffs to the district schools (24,34). "Seven Los Angeles County school districts in 1983 and nine in 1984" participated (33). The SWRL Elementary Art Program was used in 1983 in implementation programs (Getty Institute 1984:6). According to Dobbs (1988b) the current Institutes primarily used SWRL or Discover Art (1985) by Chapman (1985) although they don't endorse any particular one and teachers have access to a resource room to look at various curricula. Also in the summer of 1988 there will be an institute for curriculum development at some college campus to develop DBAE model units. Dobbs

(1988b) said that the Institute staff writes a final report for each Institute which is an internal document and not available to the public.

The Executive Summary (Getty Institute 1984) does contain an evaluation of the '83 Institute done by external evaluator, Hoepfner and art educator, Rubin. In referring to the methodology of Hoepfner's evaluation of student achievement, the compilers pointed out that it consisted of "A battery of short, norm-referenced subtests in six different levels [and] covered the K-8 span of elementary grades" (11). "Each subtest measured achievement in one of the four DBAE instructional components..."(11, 12). It was stated that the "tests provided reliable and valid assessments of student's achievements in art" (12). Further,

> When scores from standardized reading tests were used to take into account general differences in students` academic achievement, they slightly reduced the relationship between implementation and achievement in art. The relationship remained positive, however, implying not only that art can be taught as an intellectual discipline, but that increased student achievement relates directly to the instructional activities of teachers who, in this case gained their skills from the Getty Institute (12).

Greer (1985) reviewed the 1983 student achievement test procedures and results in his presentation at the 1985 NAEA Annual Convention which closely paralleled those previously stated in the Executive Summary. However, regarding the "statistical relationship between implementation and achievement in art [which] "remained positive" Greer stated, this "led to the evaluator's concluding that

we can make cautious claims that art can be taught as an educational discipline,..."(1985:63). Greer commenced his analysis by explaining that "the various subtests that comprise The Getty Summer Institute Art Survey do not presently meet psychometric standards for the guidance or individual assessment of children" (1985:63). He conceded that "the Survey is an innovative...effort that should be improved and further developed as the work of the Institute proceeds" (1985:63).

Williams (1987) described the current activities of the Getty Center and revealed that since 1982 the Center has worked with "twenty-one Los Angeles-area school districts on staff development and curriculum implementation" (13). He disclosed that "this year the Center is introducing a grant program to foster similar programs nationwide" (1987:13).

Another research and development activity of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts is the "development of discipline-based art education theory and application" (Day, et al., 1984:vi). Rush (1984) Senior Editor of the journal Studies in Art Education, wrote in her editorial "The chief architect of the Getty Center's operational definition of discipline-based art education is Greer, by virtue of his assembling the points of view (and scholars) that constitute its theoretical foundation" (204). She asserted that the "contemporary term discipline-based art education was coined by Greer...to describe the consensus articulated by Barkan [1966] that already existed piecemeal in art education literature, if not in general practice" (203). Rush (1984) claimed that "The [Getty] Institute synthesizes ideas about discipline-centered art education generated at Penn State with experience gained in later attempts to incorporate them into educational practice" (204). Efland (1987) agreed that Greer (1984)

seemed to be first to use the term discipline-based in the literature and he and others such as Barkan, Chapman, Eisner, Madeja, Hubbard, Rouse, Hine and Broudy through their curriculum ideas and projects related to the idea of DBAE (61).

Greer (1984) in his article laid "out the premises and ideas defining discipline-based art education..." (212). He thanked the "staff, faculty, and consultants of the 1983 Institute for Educators of the Visual Arts for their review of two earlier papers on discipline-based art education and their thoughtful recommendations for revision" (212). He noted that literature in art education for some 20 years has supported the direction towards this approach to teaching art and he labeled it: discipline-based art education (212). He avowed the influences of past projects he had worked on and those persons connected with the projects. He stated that DBAE's "curricular character" reflected "lessons learned while designing, developing, and testing the SWRL program...." (212, 213).

Greer described the "Aesthetic Eye Project" (Hine et al., 1976)--a project in staff development which also included Broudy's (1972) aesthetic scanning approach (213). He affirmed that the concepts learned from the past experiences in these projects aided in his planning the Getty Institute (213). Greer acknowledged many writers who influenced the field toward a discipline-based view: Lanier (1982); Chapman (1978, 1982); Eisner (1972, 1982); Feldman (1967, 1981); Efland (1976); Broudy (1972, 1983); Smith (1971, 1983); and Erickson (1977, 1979, 1983) (212). Greer characterized Efland's (1976) article as "one of the most important contributions to the literature is the identification of the school art style that sets the

art of schools clearly apart form the world of art and asks the question of whether or not there is any relationship between them" (213). Also mentioned were the consultants to the 1983 Institute for their contributions (212).

Greer (1984) affirmed Broudy's (1983) ideas that the "focus of discipline-based art instruction is art as a discipline within general education" (212). For him "the ideas, principles, concepts, and techniques drawn form the four parent disciplines [aesthetics, studio art, art history, and art criticism] define the discipline of art as we are using it for education" (213). He conceded that "defining art in this educational context does not imply that it is the only definition useful for instruction, but rather describes one approach to art education" (213).

Greer described seven distinguishing aspects of discipline-based art education: 1) focusing on "the intrinsic value of art study"; 2) presenting "art education within the larger context of aesthetic education"; 3) "developing abilities to make expressive forms, to attend to work of art in recognized and shared ways, and to place then in their historical and cultural contexts"' 4) a "written curriculum" that is systematic and sequential; 5) "concepts and skills" from the four role models that are "taught concurrently, [and] they interrelate to reinforce one another"; 6) "attention to systematic instruction with time requirements"; and 7) "attention to outcomes" (214-217). In concluding, Greer asserted that the emphasis on the subject matter of art would indicate to critics that students are learning concepts, and techniques for "When justifications for art education are made in terms of increasing compentency rather than enjoyment, school people and parents look at art as a legitimate subject of instruction" (217).

In 1985 the Getty Center for Education in the Arts published "Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools which was the "first public report on art education from the Center..." (Getty Center 1985:Foreword). In this report, the Center (1985) introduced and supported its conclusions favoring DBAE and referred to it as" a new concept for teaching art in America's schools that is gaining acceptance in art and educational communities across the country...[and referred to] seven case studies, of selected school districts...[that] support the assumption that art is basic to education" (titlepage)

The following findings regarding the changing of art education were among those included in the research of Rand Corporation research: changing the perspective of persons toward the value of art education; enlisting advocay and support for programs; and involvement of an art specialist etc. (54-58). The DBAE approach was explained and short descriptions of the four disciplines were given. Summaries about the seven school districts programs were presented by the writers of the original case studies.

Wilson (Getty Center, 1985) writing about Virginia Beach, VA discussed their comprehensive curriculum guide and raised the issue of program consistency versus creativity (27). He asserted the teachers do "have considerable latitude for creativity and flexibility" using the curriculum guide for the suggested content and planning their own lessons (28). He had discussed this in his initial case study report and had also commented that if art history and criticism "are not as fully developed as they should be, the fault seems to lie more with the field of art education for failing to provide adequate

instructional models, than with the teachers themselves" (Day et al., 1984: 7-41).

The Rand conclusions from the study stated that only two programs (Hopkins and Virginia Beach) "fully embodied the model discussed in this report" (72).

The Getty Center for Education in the Arts sponsored a series of four roundtables which met around the country during 1985 to 1986. The documentation consisted of four reports and was designated "Beyond Creating: Roundtable Series" (Getty Center n.d.). It was noted that "an average of forty invited guests attended...[and that] The purpose of...[the] meetings was to gather feedback from art and education specialists who were asked to read and react to Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools" (Getty Center n.d.:1). Duke (Getty Center n.d.) suggested that the Center's aim was to "help change the public's perception of the value of visual art education and to contribute to the growing national debate on what constitutes excellence in art education" (ii).

Discussions at the roundtables generally dealt with the factors that encouraged or constrained the particular topic or issue for that roundtable, e.g development of written, sequential curricula; advocacy; creative expression; and financial and administrative resources (1). Some of the factors discussed were: the perception of DBAE as elitist, academic,...(3); the need for professional training (29); the problem of limited resources--time, money, energy and supplies (52); and the lack of national studies about cognitive and affective skills acquired through art education (73). Questions were raised about the DBAE concept needing more clarification and whether past national curriculum efforts affected the DBAE model.

Duke (Getty Center n.d.) commented that the Center had commissioned three art educators "to write a monograph whose purpose would be to lay out the various elements of the [DBAE] concept" (13). The monograph after being drafted, she explained, would be "critiqued by a group of 110 elementary and secondary art teachers, higher education art educators, artists, art historians, art critics and aestheticians. Following this review, it will be presented at the planned national symposium" (13). Duke, at the last roundtable, mentioned that "ideas expressed in meeting would be used to shape the national conference on [DBAE] that the Getty center is sponsoring in Los Angeles" (80).

The Center's first national invitational conference entitled "Discipline-Based Art Education: What Forms Will It Take?" was held in January, 1987 (Getty Center 1987). The Center pointed out its belief "that some variation on what is...[DBAE] may be an appropriate response to the call for greater academic rigor" (iv). The Center further suggested its beliefs "that there are a number of promising ways to establish DBAE programs in schools, and [that] individual forms of DBAE may be tailored to specific districts and geographic areas" (iv). Duke credited the "regional roundtables and meetings with the cooperating organizations..[as being] instrumental in forming the agenda....and noted that "many of the issues and concerns expressed in those forums...[were] reflected in the conference agenda" (2). She acknowledged that the DBAE "concept is 'in its infancy,' [and] "the theoretical and pedagogical foundations are still being developed" (3). To address that area, she told of the monograph on DBAE written by Clark, Day and Greer which "will be published this

spring" (3). Duke introduced Eisner, one of the keynote speakers at the conference and also mentioned the "...essay by Eisner,-- 'The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools'--included in the registration materials" (3).

Some of the panel presentations at the conference included: "Art Production, Art History, Art Criticism, and Aesthetics" (22-28) These topics were presented by the authors who wrote a section in the Clark, Day and Greer monograph on their respective disciplines. Other topics included: "Advocating DBAE" (56); "Components of a DBAE Program" (70); "The Role of Creativity in DBAE" (80); and DBAE's Impact on Museum Education" (88).

Clark, one of the panelists that discussed "Components of a DBAE Program", described how local involvement and commitment affected the art program in "Bartholomew County, [sic] in Indiana, where Indiana University is located" (72). Steps mentioned were: the superintendent looked for a "DBAE program for the district"; and the "twenty-one art specialists in the district" were involved in 'finding and adapting' a good existing curriculum model" (72). Clark asserted "curriculum changes can't be imposed on the people who must implement them" and that their local "history of art instruction" must also be built on (72). He mentioned that they will have a "full proposal for a new curriculum plan ready by May" which would take "into account Indiana's recently drafted art proficiency guidelines" (72). He stated a "computerized database is proposed that will enable art educators to access teaching options suitable to the concept being presented and the age and achievement level of their students" (72). Eisner's (n.d.) essay on The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools, previously mentioned by Duke (Getty Center 1987)

discussed aspects of art education and DBAE under three broad headings: "The Arts and the Mission of Education; The Status of Art in The Schools; and What is Discipline-Based Art Education" (1, 10, 14). Duke in the Foreword to this paper, hoped Eisner's essay would "delineate some...concepts of [DBAE], without being prescriptive" (Eisner n.d.) Eisner reviewed the various purposes of the arts in school. Eisner contended that one of the reasons art has a "marginal position" in schools was due to the belief that "art was not so much taught as caught" through the use of varied media (12). He discussed the content of the four disciplines and aspects of teaching them. With respect to the role of evaluation in DBAE, he asserted that "there are three important 'subject matters' to be evaluated: the curriculum itself, the quality of teaching, and the outcomes of the program" (31). He listed eight characteristics of a DBAE program and suggested comparing them to your school district's art program (34). He concluded his essay with the idea that "the case for discipline-based art education is also a case for the development of mind" (36).

Also published by the Getty Center was the first of a series of occasional papers by "eminent scholars and practitioners in art, art criticism, art education, art history, and aesthetics... [which will] present ideas that will illuminate and inform the theory and practice of discipline-based art education" (Broudy 1987:5). Broudy explained that "the title, The Role of Imagery in Learning indicated the centrality of aesthetic perception of images" (7). He asserted that the function of the arts "is to enrich the allusionary base, the store of images and concepts that qualify for inclusion in general education" (7). He intended to discuss the role of images "as it

appears in various styles of teaching: in problem solving, in value education, and in the learning of language" (8). Broudy later suggested that "if imagery affects life and learning to the extent that this essay claims, then the skills of perceiving aesthetic images should be a major focus of instruction in the elementary grades in conjunction with performance skills" (49). He advocated using "aesthetic scanning" as a way of perceiving aesthetic images and felt "elementary classroom teachers, given a ...short period of in-service instruction, [could] master... [it] and teach it to their pupils" (50).

Duke (Getty Center n.d.:13, Getty Center 1987:3) mentioned a monograph by Clark, Day and Greer had been commissioned by the Getty Center to further define elements of DBAE. This monograph finally was published in the Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987) with nine other papers also commissioned by the Getty Center. Dobbs (1988a) described the special issue of the journal as "the most comprehensive published overview of discipline-based art education" (12). Smith as Editor of the 1987 Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2, acknowledged the "Getty Center for Education in the Arts for its generous support of this issue" and stated that "articles have been copyrighted by The J. Paul Getty Trust" (xix).

Price, program officer for the Getty Center, directed the project consisting of ten papers and traced in the Foreword of the 1987 Journal of Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2, the formulation of the project (v). She contended that the Center felt DBAE "would be more understandable and accessible if it were explicated in greater depth..."--through the ten papers (v). She explained that "The project began in the spring of 1983, when the first five papers were

commissioned" and Clark, Day and Greer were asked to write the paper "to articulate a rationale for DBAE and elaborate the concept of DBAE for an academic audience" (v). Then four other art educators, were commissioned to write about the historical antecedents of DBAE: Efland, on curriculum developments (1987); Kern, on state curriculum guidelines (1987); Sevigny, on teacher education (1987); and Smith, on theoretical writings (1987) (vi). She described the the process of Clark, Day and Greer and the antecedent writers as they worked both together or independently and asserted that "the five papers informed one another" (vi). "Four of those who critiqued the paper discussing DBAE" were asked to write on their disciplines: Spratt (1987)---art production; Kleinbauer (1987)---art history; Risatti (1987)---art criticism; and Crawford (1987)---aesthetics (vi).

Feldman's (1987) paper, on developmental psychology (the tenth one commissioned), came from concerns expressed to the Center about "the extent to which aspects of the four art disciplines can be taught to young children" (vi). Price described the input into the papers through "written reviews by peers..." and meetings in Dallas and Scottsdale which produced recommendations the writers considered (vi). She cited the Center's purpose of these papers as one of encouraging "art educators and representatives of the art disciplines to develop and refine the theoretical underpinnings of [DBAE] "(vii).

Clark et al., (1987) also described the writing process of their paper which differed timewise from Price's explanation. They stated "Early in 1984, The Getty Center for Education in the Arts convened a group of art educators who discussed the concept of discipline-based art education in response to an initial paper written by Dwaine Greer.

Following this meeting the three authors were commissioned by the Center to write a monograph about DBAE for a then unspecified audience" (183). They described the initial writing of the paper as being done both separately by chapters and then integrating it together and then meeting "with the antecedent writers and others that resulted in many revisions and drafts..."(183). Meetings were held in Toledo, Columbus, Santa Fe, Dallas and in the Scottsdale meeting "with 110 art professionals and educators" who critiqued the "current draft of the document" (183). Concurrently it "was evaluated in writing by several art educators and others commissioned by the Center" (183). Discussion and meetings continued during rewriting and the "authors met with two critics in Chicago prior to completing and submitting the final draft to the Center" (183). Then the authors, a Center commissioned editor and this journal editor discussed it. They stated "Interactions with others have been as much a part of this experience as our collaboration as coauthors" (183).

Clark et al. (1987) in the introduction to their paper, recognized briefly, the past antecedents that had influenced DBAE theory and referred to the other papers in the journal issue that dealt with major DBAE antecedents. They stated that "The explication of this theory and its identification by a recognizable and descriptive name are steps toward a general shift in the curricula and practices of art education" (131).

Sections were organized around the ten defining characteristics of a DBAE program (135). Sections and brief descriptions follow. Section **I. Art as an Essential Subject in General Education**--deals with Philosophical foundations and educational goals; Section II. Art **Disciplines and Art Education**--"deal with the concept of <u>discipline</u> as

it is used in education and with the four disciplines as sources for art curriculum content"; Section **III. Art Curricula for Students of Art**--deals with "curriculum organization, sequence and articulation, integration of art learning from the four art disciplines, and the use of artworks in curricula"; and Section **IV. Art in Every Classroom**--"deals with achieving a discipline-based art program within an entire school district" (135, 136).

In Section **II. Art Disciplines and Art Education** dealing with content, two separate characteristics numbered 3 and 4 are noted. Characteristic "3 Content for instruction is derived primarily from the disciplines of aesthetics, art criticism, art history, and art production" (147). In their discussion of this section, Clark et al. (1987) cited Barkan (1966) as suggesting "that the fields of art history, criticism, art production, and aesthetics could provide the content for a broader understanding of art" than using only art production (147, 148). "Building upon this contribution, we have designated these fields of art study as disciplines and see each art discipline as contributing unique and essential art content for educational purposes" (148). They claimed this standard "eliminates...non-art activities that too often have been mistaken for art programs" (Efland 1976) and have no relationship to the adult art world (148).

They chose three of the ten features of disciplines from King & Brownell's (1966) work on curriculum theory to discuss in relation to DBAE (148). They stated that "each of the four art disciplines can be viewed as having (1) a community of scholars or artists, (2) a syntactical structure or method of inquiry, and (3) a conceptual

structure" (148). "These features", they explained, "can be used to derive, validate, and organize content for art learning" (148). Clark et al. discussed each of the three features.

Regarding a community of scholars or artists they mentioned those of "aestheticians, art critics, art historians, and artists". Regarding methods of inquiry, they referred to aestheticians applying philosophical analysis. Regarding conceptual structure, they referred to an art historian who must "gain the knowledge of concepts relevant to the history of art..." (149, 150).

They asserted that "DBAE is not intended to become the study of four separate art fields [but] "It is... a way to study the subject of art, with valid content for such study being grounded in the disciplines of art" (151). They contended that art educators are responsible for "ways to integrate learning from the four fields and allow each art discipline to complement the others..." (151).

Included in this section were short versions of the concepts and skills defining the four art disciplines (151). Within the issue of the journal were separate expanded articles written by the same authors: Spratt (1987) on art production; Kleinbauer (1987) on art history; Riasatti (1987) on art criticism; and Crawford (1987) on aesthetics. Each author described how his discipline could interrelate with the others in DBAE. Several authors touched on the issue of mass communications' proliferation of visual images. Spratt (1987) stated "Our 'thinking' is increasingly being molded by the direct perception of images" (197). Kleinbauer (1987) also discussed the need for "visual literacy" to comprehend the visual images we see around us (206).

Feldman (1987) in the tenth paper commissioned by the Getty

Center, asserted that changes are occurring in both art education and developmental psychology and that "new theoretical developments" in developmental psychology may be very useful to art education (243). He stated that "the most important change in developmental theory... [that] occurred in the past decade...is the distinction ...between universal and nonuniversal development...[which] attempts to separate those aspects of human change and transformation that are essentially inevitable and will occur in all children, regardless of background and experience, from those aspects that require the systematic application of cultural resources and effort by those who seek to facilitate developmental change" (247). He acknowledged the importance of universal development theories and suggested their use "as a general guide to what can reasonably be expected to work with children at a given age or grade level" (249).

He suggested that the "Universal-to-Unique Continuum" would help clarify issues such as: "Is art to be taught to all children...? Should art be a part of the curriculum at all ages?" (249-250). For Feldman, "the critical issue is when to introduce various kinds of material and with whom" (251).

Part III. Developing Issues.

While the discussion presented in Part II. seemed to present an organized and well orchestrated development of DBAE theory, there were developing "issues" that appeared in the current literature which confirmed that the form of DBAE theory to be used in the teaching of art is far from an absolute. Even those writing for the Getty Center had acknowledged that on going change was expected--as in Duke's (1983) article regarding the Center's research and development activities. She stated "They are not cast in stone; they are not irreversible" (1983:6). Greer (1984) said "...there has been and will continue to be an ongoing evolution of the principles embodied in discipline-based art education in the field at large" (213).

Through the presentation of the Getty Center literature it was seen that many issues were mentioned by the writers of papers or participants in the programs. Some issues were the: role of art specialists; cost of implementation; lack of DBAE models; inadequacy of teacher education courses; concern about creativity and DBAE; lack of knowledge base to give information to program development; problem of time, space and supplies; role of museums in art education; difficulty of formulating student testing procedures; role of images in mass communication; lack of research in determining lesson sequence; difficulty of implementation at the secondary level; ways the disciplines in DBAE interrelate; difficulties of curriculum implementation; inadequacies of existing DBAE curricula; confusion over terminology; and role of philanthropy in art education.

Since Greer's (1984) journal article appeared there seemed to be little criticism of the Getty programs. Hamblen (1987) stated "Little

critical dialogue on DBAE appears in the literature" (75). A substantial part of the existing journals contained explanations of DBAE theory. Asking for more information about DBAE, Salome (1987) Senior Editor of Studies in Art Education described the literature dealing with DBAE since 1984 as being "of a translative, theoretical, or demonstrative nature to establish that art can be taught as a discipline-based subject" (195). He acknowledged that a previous invitation ..."to the first five authors in this issue to clarify the approach and describe classroom application strategies" had been accepted (195).

Perhaps the delayed rate at which critical comments appeared was related to the question of who spoke for the Getty. Hamblen (1987) asserted that "DBAE, as currently defined, is inextricably linked to the educational programs of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts to the extent that it is often unclear whether proponents of DBAE are acting as individuals or as spokespersons for the Getty Center" (75). Marantz (1988) current Senior Editor of Studies in Art Education commented about Eisner's (1987) essay that was published in Art Education, September 1987. He said, "This reprint of a publication by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts may be a definitive policy statement. On the others [sic] hand, so many other [sic] write as advocates of this private organization that it's impossible to nail down a single statement as THE policy" (68).

Early journal articles had often noted at the bottom of the first page statements to the effect that, "The author is a faculty member of the 1985 Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, and a member of its advisory committee" (DiBlasio 1985:197). However, a later journal article by the same author just indicated the university

that she was connected with , i.e. under her name at the top of the article (DiBlasio 1987: 221). Therefore, it was difficult for the reader to know if the article was reflecting the writer's opinion or Getty Center policy, especially if the person's name was not prominently mentioned in past literature.

There may also be a problem in disseminating information within the art education field. The National Art Education Association (NAEA) a voluntary professional association of teachers of art, has and continues to publish two journals: Studies in Art Education and Art Education, both of which are a major sources for disseminating Getty information. If art teachers belong to the NAEA, the journals would be accessible to them as would the opportunity to go to NAEA national conventions. Some information from the Getty Center was presented at the conventions (e.g. Greer 1985) and apparently did not appear in the journals. Therefore any discussion of related issues might be hampered by non attendance at the conferences. Additionally if art teachers or the libraries they have access to, don't subscribe to the journals, then current trends, information, etc. would not be generally available. With the exception of the three Rand Corporation volumes, however, Getty Center publications are free for the asking.

Some art educators seemingly not connected to the Getty Center programs have tried to define issues. Hamblen (1987) examined a number of issues in her article such as: DBAE and technocratic rationality; the language of DBAE (e.g. rigor, discipline); integration and teaching of the four disciplines; content identification and sequencing; use of role-modeling; type of art object studied; inclusion of aesthetics; aesthetic scanning as the

chosen art criticism format; choice of curricula for elementary teachers; consideration of individual differences; evaluation procedures; and DBAE connected to the Getty Center programs (68-76).

Regarding the last issue mentioned, Hamblen (1987) suggested that "Unlike the Penn State Conference which initiated multiple lines of research and the evolution of the aesthetic education model within the field, DBAE has been presented to the field by a philanthropic foundation as a more or less complete program, only having to be worked out in its details" (75).

Several art educators have questioned the formulation of the Getty Institute and DBAE theory. McFee (1984) in her article that appeared in the same journal as Greer's (1984) first definition of DBAE, had access to the Fall 1983 Interim Report of the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts. She discussed the report of the ongoing 1983 Getty Institute and stated "It is hoped that the generative aspects involved in its formulation, while not necessarily appropriate for its implementation, will be available for theorists and researchers in the field" (278). Also, she asked that the "Institute's decision making processes need to be made available for study as well as its curriculum design and demonstration processes, to make make contribution to the profession. We need to know whose traditions in art history and in art curriculum are being selected from these larger fields and why" (280).

There does not seem to be any direct explanation in print of the "Institute's decision making process" or discussion of the process by those involved. One possible explanation of the process came from Duke (1983) who noted that one premise that the Institute was based on was that of..."studies about curriculum change in schooling..." (7).

In the same article she reported that some of the findings from studies were: "Lasting curriculum changes result when there has been substantive teacher training; continued classroom assistance;...[and] emphasis on teacher participation in curricular decision-making" (7). These findings are almost identical to the conclusions of a 1978 study entitled Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change Vol. III: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations (Berman & McLaughlin 1978:34) prepared for the U.S. Office of Education. Berman & McLaughlin's (1987) study was referred to in the Rand work done for the Getty Centers seven school district project; i.e.: "Previous Rand work has shown that any kind of institutional change is difficult to design, initiate, and implement" (McLaughlin, et al., 1984:4).

McFee (1984)--based on the Interim Report--indicated "A director [Greer] worked for a year in establishing, with his advisors, and faculty the structure of the discipline-based art education program" (278). A similar statement was given in the Executive Summary (Getty Institute 1984) in that "The staff was responsible for determining the Institute goals planning the program activities, and facilitating all logistical arrangements" (2).

Greer's (1984) article described his "past experiences" used in planning the Getty Institute (e.g. directing the SWRL Elementary Art Program (1982) and participation in the Aesthetic Eye Project (Hine, et al., 1976) (212-213). Sevigny (1987) after he described the Aesthetic Eye Project, stated that it was "a significant antecedent of DBAE because it foreshadows many of the approaches currently being utilized in the Getty Center for Education in the Arts...in-service program, the Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, a five-year

teacher education pilot experiment. This is not surprising, in that many of the project's professional personnel (i.e., Broudy, Hine, Greer, Silverman and Clark), have had direct leadership roles in the conceptual development and definition of DBAE" (117). In the Executive Summary (Getty Institute 1984) it was stated that "The decision to focus on discipline-based instruction coupled with research findings on how curriculum change in schools is best achieved became the foundation for planning the Getty Institute... " (1).

Regarding the formulation of the DBAE theory, Greer (1984) stated "The present description is a set of definitions and guidelines arrived at during my work in the areas of curriculum and staff development. It represents a contemporary version of the understanding of art education a discipline; it is a synthesis of developments that have taken place over the years since the Penn State Seminar" (212). As suggested earlier, Greer (1984) used past experiences to plan the Getty Institute, and he "...began to set down concepts that would establish a definition of discipline-based education" (213). Rush (1984) characterized him as the "chief architect of the Getty Center's operational definition of discipline-based art education... by virtue of his assembling the points of view (and scholars) that constitute its theoretical foundation (204).

Greer (1984) thanked "the staff, faculty, and consultants of the 1983 Institute... for their review of two earlier papers on...[DBAE] and their thoughtful recommendations for revision" (212). Again there does not seem to be any published literature on any of the review or recommendations.

MacGregor (1985) asserted "Barkan's (1966) proposal mentioned three roles for the student: producer, historian, critic. The

dimension added to the present Getty program, the role of aesthetician, is less easy to visualize as separate domain" (242). He further suggested that, "One day someone may write an account of the deliberations of the Institute's six initial faculty members, and give some indication of the arguments presented for and against inclusion of the aesthetic domain as a domain" (243).

In order to determine when aesthetics became a part of the DBAE theory, one might look to Duke (1983) who remarked that "Art education should be approached as a subject of study with a sequential curriculum that integrates instruction in art history and criticism, studio production, and aesthetic perception" (6). She did not mention anything about the four areas as being distinct disciplines nor did she specifically refer to the term aesthetics. When she described the first Getty Institute's program she said of those involved, that "we expect that their courses will include instruction in art history, production and criticism..." (7). She also mentioned the Rand research project of seven school districts looking at art programs "...which attempt to provide regular instruction in art history, art criticism, art making, and aesthetic awareness" (6). In the Rand studies (McLaughlin & Thomas 1984) it was explained that only art history, art criticism, and art production would be considered "Since that time the thinking of the Getty Center has evolved to include four domains--separating the discipline of aesthetics..." (4).

McFee (1984) declared, based on the 1983 Interim Report, that "A clearly stated position is taken that the structure of art as a discipline includes only art history, art criticism, studio production, and aesthetic perception" (277).

It appeared that when the Greer (1984) article was published it was the first occasion when the term disciplined-based art education was used (e.g. Efland 1987:61), and the first occasion when the term aesthetics was one of the disciplines. Greer (1984) did mention the role of aesthetic perception under his discussion of aesthetics. Sevigny (1987) mentioned that "The Aesthetic Eye project is highlighted for providing that given training, school personnel can plan and implement effective instruction based on the aesthetic perception approach" (117). This may indicate how aesthetic perception was initially included in the Institute's approach, while only later when Greer (1984) presented his DBAE theory was aesthetics actually included as part of DBAE.

In explaining the process of writing the ten papers published in the special issue of the Journal of Aesthetic Education, there was a conflict in the time the Clark et al., paper began. Price in the Foreword of the 1987 Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 said Clark, Day and Greer were commissioned in the spring of 1983 (v) while Clark et al., (1987) stated that "Early in 1984, The Getty Center... convened a group of art educators who discussed the concept of... [DBAE] in response to an initial paper written by ...Greer. Following this meeting the three authors were commissioned by the Center to write a monograph about DBAE for a then unspecified audience" (183). Depending on whether or not the paper was begun in 1983 or 1984 then Clark and Day may have had a greater impact on the initial development of DBAE.

Some art educators have also questioned the number of disciplines chosen by those commissioned by the Getty Center such as Greer (1984) or Clark, et al., 1987). In their paper, Clark et al., (1987) based

their content for instruction on the "fields of art history, criticism, art production, and aesthetics" as suggested by Barkan (1966) and stated that "Building upon this contribution, we have designated these fields of study as disciplines and see each art discipline as contributing unique and essential art content for educational purposes" (147-148).

MacGregor (1985) asserted that the Getty Institute has placed "...before the public a statement of what discipline-based art education is (Greer,1984)" (245). He stated that "Four parent disciplines are involved: aesthetics, studio art, art history, and art criticism ....[and that]...the continuing absence of agreement on what constitutes a discipline makes these four contenders as valid as any other" (245). Regarding studio art, he submitted that it probably was not appropriate in terms of it being a separate discipline "...since its content is not clearly demarcated, and its techniques often are not rule-governed" (245).

Hausman (1987) declared that the "particular conceptions of 'parent disciplines' that need to be taught in certain specified ways" are the issue (56-57). He suggested that there was further work necessary to decipher the meaning of the "term 'discipline' [when used] in relation to the teaching of art" (58). He quoted Barkan (1963) in relation to argument about art education being a discipline. In a departure form the four disciplines of DBAE, Hausman (1987), asserted that the disciplines for teaching art should be a part of a "multi-disciplined base" which for him would include: "studio practice, art history, aesthetics, art criticism, psychology, philosophy, history, literature, science--indeed, the full range of our human knowledge" (58). He questioned how a teacher could cover all

the content of these disciplines and concluded that the individual teacher "would shape the content for instruction using his or her own experience and the context of the classroom situations..." (58).

Chalmers (1987) asserted that "... most current conceptions of discipline-based art education smack of four narrow specialisms: art criticism, art history, art production, and aesthetics" (58). He offered a remedy to such limitations "...by adding the disciplines and perspectives of the social sciences, particularly anthropology and sociology" (58). He found support for his complaint with the work of "European scholars and the art educators...[who] argue that the study of art must be unbiased and interdisciplinary and that the dominance of any one discipline...is an obstacle to its development" (60).

Gray (1987) claimed that a "weakness in DBAE formulation... exists through the inclusion of aesthetics as a discrete area of study" (54). For Gray, aesthetics is integrally a part of the other three disciplines and by itself the study of aesthetics would "...create an unnecessary diversion toward an artificial area for teachers to move in where some philosophers fear to tread" (55). He found it difficult to believe"...that teachers reading about DBAE are aware that the four-part description at its best is essentially an idealization.

Perhaps more than just the "four-part description" previously referred to is an "idealization". In the Clark et al., (1987) paper the authors compared the creative self-expression approach to the DBAE approach in the areas of: "Goals; Content; Curriculum; Conception of Learner; Conception of Teacher; Creativity; Implementation; Works of Art; and Evaluation" (133-134). Hood (1988) pointed out that the footnote for that comparison explained, "This comparison contrasts two

extreme (emphasis added) theoretical positions for purposes of clarification. In practice, there are few school art education programs that completely exemplify either position. Many programs can be found that fall between the two positions on any of the topics of comparison" (Clark et al., 1987:134).

One of the difficulties in defining issues is the problem of language and terms. Participants in the Getty Center Roundtable Series (Getty Center n.d.) mentioned "...confusion about the terms (e.g. 'aesthetics,' 'art criticism')" (58). Another group asked "Can the terms 'art criticism' and 'aesthetics' be defined more specifically ..."(21). Smith (1987) addressed the terminology issue and claimed "The terms used to designate areas of instruction in the arts are of necessity quite general and mean little until carefully defined" (23). He explained that "...confusion is to be expected when the terms are interchanged without qualification, which has sometimes been the case in the literature under review" (23). Smith (1987) discussed the terms aesthetic education and art education and said they "...convey little sense outside the contexts in which they are used" (23). He explained that "the term aesthetic education has played a strategic role in enlarging the scope of art education to include not only creative but also a range of appreciative, historical, and critical activities. The term has also often implied a concern with all of the major arts, not just the visual arts" (23). He also submitted that..."aesthetic education may also involve the study and appreciation of the natural and humanly designed environments..." (24). Finally, he concluded "Despite the distinctions just indicated, there is nonetheless considerable overlap of interests on the part of those who use the terms art education and

aesthetic education, and so long as a writer's intentions and definitions are kept in mind, using one or the other of the expressions does no harm" (24).

Hamblen (1987) contended "DBAE proponents need to answer what is meant by aesthetics, i.e., whether they are dealing with aesthetic perception, philosophical aesthetics, psychological aesthetics--or all of these" (71).

As a further example of this terminology interchange, it was noted that DiBlasio (1985) declared "The DBAE approach cannot realized through simple 'enrichment' of studio-dominated programs, i.e., through the insertion of token units of history, criticism, or aesthetic perception (emphasis added)...(203) but in her 1987 article she stated "Thus art history, art criticism and aesthetics (emphasis added) are not regarded as convenient resources by which a studio-dominated curriculum might be enriched..."(225).

Therefore, the definitions of the Glossary of this paper--such as art, aesthetics, etc. might need to be broadened and/or changed to meet the usage intended in DBAE. Crawford (1987) for example explained that "Today ...aesthetics is conceived somewhat more broadly and tends not to concentrate exclusively on the concept of beauty,..."(227).

These issues may need further clarification and discussion before the DBAE approach is indeed settled. Various writers believe that a continuing dialogue and refinement is necessary.

Clark et al., (1987) concluded their paper by claiming "we look forward to further scholarly discussion and criticism of the issues raised in this paper, and we anticipate further delineation,

elaboration, and development of the DBAE construct" (183).

Marantz (1988) Senior Editor of Studies in Art Education wrote in his editorial, "I am volunteering STUDIES as a logical locus for the debate because it has been charged by the NAEA to be the publication devoted to 'issues and research'" (68). He continued "I'm asking that you (the collective you) respond ... and make use of these pages to begin a rigorous inquiry into significant issues" (70). "What issue do you care about that makes a difference, one that is made of guts not magical gossamer wings, one that lends itself to intellectual debate rather that self-aggrandizing romantic rhetoric?" (71).

Perhaps appropriate at this time also was Barkan's (1962) past suggestion that "When basic ideas are in the process of transformation, there is and must be an inevitable grinding of opinions one upon the other" (12).

CONCLUSIONS

The study has shown that the J. Paul Getty Trust, and specifically the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, has created the format of discipline-based art education which has become an acceptable approach to elementary school art education in the United States. DBAE has come a long way since the emergence of its antecedents in the Penn State Seminar in 1965. While some writers have acknowledged that DBAE is merely one approach to art education, DBAE in fact has emerged as an accepted form of instruction.

There clearly are unsettled issues with regard to DBAE theory and the model program exemplified by the Getty Institute for Educators in the Visual Arts. Needed clarification can be achieved through further discussion in the various journals in the field of art education, discussion at national art conventions, and participation in Getty Center sponsored conferences, etc.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. Some consensus as to the definition of DBAE or art education terminology should be achieved, perhaps through a dictionary of art education.
2. There should be further discussion in journal articles to clarify DBAE issues.
3. Those involved in art education should keep current in DBAE activities, by reading and evaluating current journal articles, Getty Center for Education in the Arts publications, and by participating in state and national art education organization activities.
4. Additional research needs to be initiated in the teaching of art with regard to: the integration of the four disciplines of DBAE, evaluation procedures, and curriculum development.
5. Dissemination of the evaluation results of the Institute's activities from 1983 to the present--particularly in the area of student achievement--should be made available without further delay.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barkan, Manuel. "Transition In Art Education-Changing Concepts of Curriculum Content and Teaching." Art Education 15.7 (Oct. 1962): 12-18, 27, 28. (7,13,39,44,82)

Barkan, Manuel. "Is There A Discipline Of Art Education" Studies in Art Education 4.2 (Spring 1963): 4-9. (8,12,40,45,78)

Barkan, Manuel. "Curriculum Problems In Art Education." A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development. (USOE Cooperative Research Project No. V-002) Ed. E. L. Mattil. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1966. 240-255. (10,36,41,56,67,75,78)

Barkan, Manuel., Laura Chapman, and Evan Kern. Guidelines: Curriculum Development for Aesthetic Education. St. Louis: Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, 1970. (42)

Berman, Paul., and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, R-1589/HEW, May 1978. (74)

Broudy, Harry S. Enlightened Cherishing: An Essay on Aesthetic Education. Urbana, IL: U of Illinois P, 1972. (42,57)

Broudy, Harry S. "A Common Curriculum in Aesthetics and Fine Arts." Eighty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, Il: National Society for the Study of Education, 1983. (25,57,58)

Broudy, Harry S. The Role of Imagery in Learning, Occasional Paper 1. Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Center for Educ. in the Arts, 1987. (5,28,63,64)

Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1960. (40)

Chalmers, F. Graeme. "Beyond Current Conceptions Of Discipline-Based Art Education." Art Education 40.5 (Sept. 1987): 58-61. (38,79)

Chapman, Laura. Approaches to Art in Education. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978. (13,43,44,57)

Chapman, Laura. Instant Art Instant Culture: The Unspoken Policy for American Schools. New York: Teachers College, Columbia U, 1982. (57)

Clark, Gilbert., and Enid Zimmerman. "A Walk in the Right Direction: A Model for Visual Arts Education." Studies in Art Education 19.2 (1978): 34-49. (11,44,45)

Clark, Gilbert., and Enid Zimmerman. "Toward a Discipline of Art Education." Phi Delta Kappan 63.1 (Sept. 1981): 53-55. (12,44,45)

Clark, Gilbert A., Michael D. Day, and D. Dwaine Greer. "Discipline-based Art Education: Becoming Students of Art." Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 129-193. (29,44,47, 65-68,77,79-81)

Crawford, Donald W. "Aesthetics in Discipline-based Art Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 227-239. (33,65,68,81)

Davis, William. "Los Angeles comes of age as an 'arts city.'" Chicago Tribune. 3 Jan. 1988, early ed.: Sec. 12: 4-5. (48)

Day, Michael. "The Compatibility of Art History and Studio Art Activity in the Junior High School Art Program: A Comparison of Two Methods of Teaching Art History." Studies in Art Education 10.2 (Winter 1969): 57-65. (44)

Day, Michael., et al. Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production. An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Volume: II Case Studies of Seven Selected Sites. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, R-3161/2-JPG, December 1984. (19,56,59)

DiBlasio, Margaret K. "Continuing the Translation: Further Delineation of the DBAE Format" Studies in Art Education 26.4 (Summer 1985): 197-205. (71,81)

DiBlasio, Margaret K. "Reflections on the Theory of Discipline-Based Art Education" Studies in Art Education 28.4 (Summer 1987): 221-226. (71,81)

Discover Art. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications, 1985. (54)

Dobbs, Steven Mark., ed. Research Readings for Discipline-Based Art Education: A Journey Beyond Creating Reston, VA: National Art Education Association, 1988a. (16,47,64)

Duke, Leilani Lattin. "The Getty Center for Education in the Arts." Art Education 36.5 (Sept. 1983): 4-8. (17,48-50,52,54,70,73,76)

Efland, Arthur. "The School Art Style: A Functional Analysis." Studies in Art Education 17.2 (1976): 37-44. (11,44,57,67)

Efland, Arthur D. "Curriculum Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 57-94. (14,39-42,46,56,65,77)

Eisner, Elliot. Teaching Art to the Young: A Curriculum Development Project in Art Education. Stanford, CA: Stanford U, 1969. (42,44)

Eisner, Elliot. Educating Artistic Vision. New York: Macmillan, 1972. (13,43,44,57)

Eisner, Elliot. Cognition and Curriculum: A Basis for Deciding What To Teach. New York: Longman, 1982. (57)

Eisner, Elliot. The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools. Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Center for Educ. in the Arts, n.d. (1,28,62,63)

Eisner, Elliot., and D. Ecker. Readings in Art Education. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell, 1966. (44)

Erickson, Mary. "Uses of History in Art Education." Studies in Art Education 18.3 (1977): 22-29. (57)

Erickson, Mary. "Historical Thinking and Aesthetic Education." Journal of Aesthetic Education 13.4 (1979): 81-92. (57)

Erickson, Mary. "Teaching Art History as an Inquiry Process." Art Education 36.5 (1983): 28-31. (57)

Feldman, David Henry. "Developmental Psychology and Art Education: Two Fields at the Crossroads." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 243-259. (34,65,68,69)

Feldman, Edmund Burke. Art as Image and Idea. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967. (57)

Feldman, Edmund Burke. Becoming Human Through Art: Aesthetic Experience in the School. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970. (13,43)

Feldman, Edmund Burke. Varieties of Visual Experience. Englewood, Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971. (44)

Feldman, Edmund Burke. Varieties of Visual Experience. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1981. (57)

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools. Los Angeles, CA: J. Paul Getty Trust, April 1985. (1,26,35,59,60)

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Proceedings Report "Beyond Creating: Roundtable Series." Getty Center for Educ. in the Arts, n.d. (26,60,61,64,80)

Getty Center for Education in the Arts. "Discipline-Based Art Education: What Forms Will It Take?" National Invitational Conference. Los Angeles: Getty Center for Educ. in the Arts, Jan. 1987. (27,61,62,64)

Getty Institute For Educators On The Visual Arts. "Executive Summary." Final Report: Institute '83, July 1, 1982--June 30, 1984. Dec. 1984. (23,53-55,74,75)

Good, Carter V., ed. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw, 1973. (4-6)

Gray, James U. "A Seventy-Five Percent Solution for the Success of DBAE." Art Education 40.5 (Sept. 1987): 54-57. (38,79)

Greer, W. Dwaine. "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study." Studies in Art Education 25.4 (Summer 1984): 212-218. (1,6,14,25,35,38,56-58,70,73-75,77,78)

Greer, W. Dwaine. "DBAE Student Achievement Tests." Abstracts of Research Presentations. Dallas: National Art Education Association, 1985. (24,55,56,72)

Greer, W. Dwaine., et al. Architecture: Toward a SWRL Elementary Art Program. (SWRL Tech. Note No. TN 3-72-44) Los Alamitos, CA: SWRL, 1972. Copies of the guide are available from Greer at the Dept. of Art, University of Arizona. (42)

Greer, W. Dwaine and Jean C. Rush. "A Grand Experiment: The Getty Institutes for Educators on the Visual Arts." Art Education 38.1 (Jan. 1985): 24, 33-35. (4,22,54)

Hamblen, Karen A. "An Examination of Discipline-Based Art Education Issues." Studies in Art Education 28.2 (Winter 1987): 68-78. (1,35,70-73,81)

Hausman, Jerome J. "Another View of Discipline Based Art Education." Art Education 40.1 (Jan. 1987): 56-60. (37,78)

Hine, Francis., et al. The Aesthetic Eye Project: Final Report. Los Angeles: Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, 1976. (25,42,44,57,74)

Indiana Department of Education. Fine Arts Proficiency Guide. Indianapolis, IN: Author, 1987. (1)

Kaufman, Irving. "Art Education: A Discipline" Studies in Art Education 4.2 (Spring 1963): 15-23. (9,13,40)

Kern, Evan J. "Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education: State Departments of Education Curriculum Documents." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 35-56. (15,39,43,46,65)

King, A., and J. Brownell. The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966. (67)

Kleinbauer, W. Eugene. "Art History in Discipline-based Art Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 205-215. (31,65,68)

Lanier, Vincent. "A Plague on All Your Houses: The Tragedy of Art Education". Studies in Art Education 25.3 (1974): 12-15. (44)

Lanier, Vincent. The Arts We See: A Simplified Introduction to the Visual Arts. New York: Teachers College, Columbia U, 1982. (57)

Logan, Frederick M. "Is There A Discipline Of Art Education" Studies in Art Education 4.2 (Spring 1963): 10-14. (9,13,40)

Lowenfeld, Viktor. Creative and Mental Growth. 1st ed. New York: Macmillan, 1947. (39)

Lowenfeld, Viktor. Creative and Mental Growth 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1957. (39)

MacGregor, Ronald N. "An Outside View of Discipline-based Art Education." Studies in Art Education 26.4 (Summer 1985): 241-246. (1,36,75,76,78)

Marantz, Kenneth. "Editorial: The Importance of Being Language: The Passion of Political Possibilities" Studies in Art Education 29.2 (Winter 1988): 67-71. (71,82)

Mattil, E. L., ed. A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development. (USOE Cooperative Research Project No. V-002) University Park: The Pennsylvania State U, 1966. (11,21)

McFee, June K. Preparation for Art. 2nd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1971. (44)

McFee, June K. "An Analysis of the Goal, Structure, and Social Context of the 1965 Penn State Seminar and the 1983 Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts." Studies in Art Education 25.4 (Summer 1984): 276-280. (1,21,53,73,74,76)

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin, and Margaret A. Thomas. Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production. An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Districts, Volume: 1 Comparing the Process of Change Across Districts. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, R-3161/1-JPG, December 1984. (19,49-51)

McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin., Margaret A. Thomas, and Joyce Peterson. Art History, Art Criticism, and Art Production. An Examination of Art Education in Selected School Disticts, Volume: III Executive Summary. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, R-3161/3-JPG, December 1984. (20,51,52,74)

Oregon Department of Education. Elementary Art Education: A Handbook for Oregon Teachers. Salem: Author, 1977. (43)

Risatti, Howard. "Art Criticism in Discipline-based Art Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 217-225. (32,65,68)

Rush, Jean C. "Editorial: Who Decides?" Studies in Art Education 25.4 (Summer 1984): 203-204. (56,75)

Salome, Richard A. "Editorial: Another Look at DBAE" Studies in Art Education 28.4 (Summer 1987): 195-197. (71)

Sevigny, Maurice J. "Discipline-based Art Education and Teacher Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 95-126. (15,39,42,43,45,65,74,75,77)

Schwab, Joseph J. "The Concept of the Structure of a Discipline." The Educational Record Vol. ? (July 1962): 197-205. (8)

Smith, Ralph A. Aesthetics and Problems of Education. Urbana-Champaign: U of Illinois P, 1971. (44,57)

Smith, Ralph A. "The Purpose and Place of the Arts in Education." Viewpoints (Spring 1983): 1-5. [sic] (57)

Smith, Ralph A. "The Changing Image of Art Education: Theoretical Antecedents of Discipline-based Art Education." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 3-34. (13,39,40,43,44, (46,65,80)

Spratt, Frederick. "Art Production in Discipline-based Art Education" The Journal of Aesthetic Education 21.2 (Summer 1987): 187-204. (5,30,65,68)

SWRL Elementary Art Program. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1982. (25,74)

Williams, Harold M. "Philanthropy and Art Education--The Role of the Private Foundation." Design For Arts In Education 88.4 (March/April 1987): 12-14. (18,48,56)

==========

Dobbs, Steven Mark. Senior Program Officer, The Getty Center for Education in the Arts. Telephone Conversation. 9 Feb. 1988b. (For Getty Center information contact: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1875 Century Park East, Suite 2300 Los Angeles, CA 90067-2561 Telephone 213 277-9188; correct as of Mar. 1988)

Hood, Susan. Assistant Professor of Fine Arts, Indiana University at South Bend. Conversation. 3 March 1988.

STUDENT QUALIFICATIONS

Name: Bonnie A. Brueseke

Address: 52741 Arbor Drive, South Bend IN 46635

Education: B.S.-Education, Illinois State University, Normal, IL; Completing M.S. in Secondary Education.

Employment: 1 year as Art Instructor, Spencer Elementary and Junior High Schools, Spencer IN; 5 years as Art Instructor, Clay High School, South Bend, IN

Interest In topic: The topic will be valuable in increasing my knowledge of the discipline-based art education approach since it has been adopted by the Indiana Department of Education.